

SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY



TIRUPATI

ANCIENT *versus* MODERN
“SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM”

ANCIENT *versus* MODERN “SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM”

OR
THEOSOPHY
AND
CAPITALISM, FASCISM, COMMUNISM

BY
BHAGAVAN DAS, D.LITT.

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE
ADYAR, MADRAS, INDIA
1934

FOREWORD

A SENTENCE here and a phrase there may make it appear as if this booklet was addressed to Members of the Theosophical Society only. This is very far from the writer's intention. On the contrary, he anxiously wishes and in all humility hopes that it may attract even more attention outside than inside the T.S., especially in India.

The subject is almost literally a 'burning' topic to-day, heart-burning and head-burning, all over the world, and especially in this land which is now in the birth-pangs of a new epoch. As a theosophist and therefore humanist, the writer sees, with heartfelt sympathy, that almost all the countries of this earth to-day are in similar travail, Russia alone having brought forth her child, in terrible agony, but being not yet quite safe from all danger of disastrous puerperal fever. Yet, having come into an Indian body this time, by 'the accident of birth,' he cannot help feeling that India's

pains and dangers are greater than those of other countries. He is therefore very anxiously wishful that the old ideas and practices, which he has tried to put into new words and set forth in relief against the background of, and in comparison and contrast with, the great modern trends of thought and activity, may be duly considered by the social, economic, political, and religious leaders of this unhappy land, who are acting as (unfortunately very disagreeing) accoucheurs for the birth of the New India from the Old. He earnestly believes that if they utilise the best in the old methods and remedies, they will bring to birth, not a forceps-distorted monstrosity, but a healthy, shapely, intelligent New India, full of vitality and promise and prospect of long and happy life. The acute dissensions between the doctors, which threaten death instead of promising life and health to the patient, are a main reason for the present attempt to suggest the old traditional way of treatment in new and modified form—the way which reconciles all the differences by simply pruning off the exaggerations of single features and half-truths which alone cause those dissensions.

The writer therefore prays such readers as are not interested in and may perhaps feel

estranged by the references to the T.S. and its literature and to Theosophy, to just score out the former and to substitute for the word Theosophy the word Ṭasawwuf (Sūfism), or Brahma-vidyā, or Ātma-vidyā, or Metaphysic, or Philosophy, or Psycho-physics, or Psychology, or Ideology, whichever they like most, and then to give some time and thought to the ancient ideas feebly endeavoured to be expounded.

It seems to this writer that India's slogans should be—not the merely Materialist Interpretation of History, but “the Spirituo-Materialist Interpretation of History,” since the Universe is obviously compounded of both Spirit or Mind and Matter, Purusha and Prakṛti; not Class-war, (except such and so far, and only such and so far, as may be made absolutely unavoidable by ruthless obduracy on the part of Capitalists), but “Class-co-operation” through class-balance and class-reconciliation; not a Classless Society, nor a dichotomised Rich-and-Poor Society, nor an infinitely sub-divided fissiparous Caste-ful Society, but a “Society of Temperamental-Vocational Classes” justly co-ordinated; not an utterly homogeneous literal Equality in all respects, nor an utterly heterogeneous and grossly iniquitous Inequality,

but an "Equitability" in the partition of different kinds of Work and of corresponding appropriate sufficient Recompense and Incentive ; not the placing of the necks of whole Peoples under the heels of single or a few despotic Individuals, Dictators or Presidents or Emperors or Kings or Viceroys, or Presidia or Cabinets of Commissars or Ministers or Members or other varieties of Oligarchs, nor the crushing of all Individualities under the steam-roller wheels of a Machine-like Communism or Fascism or Bureaucracy, not Autocracy nor Mobocracy, but the careful fostering of "Individual Speciality in assonance with Social Solidarity" ; not a sudden and complete break with the past, but a "Continuity of the peculiar National Genius," of the best in the ancient Traditions ; not a blind imitation of the latest experiments going on in any other country, nor a blind clinging to all of our past without discrimination between its good and its bad, its suitable and its unsuitable, features, nor a blind rejection of what is good and suitable in these experiments or in that past, but a far-sighted and judicious "Combination of the Old and the New," "Respect for old Tradition as well as new Exploration" ; not abolition of Religion and Property and Family, nor perpetuation of the

conditions in which they now are, but “Purification of Religion, Property, Family,” by abolition of Priestcraft and blind unreasoning superstition, of Rulercraft and Financier-craft and Capitalist-Militarist-Imperialist greed and arrogance, and of Lustcraft and sex-corruption and degeneration and mismating within as well as without the Family; not unchecked Capitalism, nor Fascism, nor Bolshevism, but the indigenous and genuinely philosophical, psychological, “Ancient time-tested Scientific Socialism” of the best Indian Tradition.

This booklet endeavours to explain the reasons why India’s slogans should be such as these.

Dr. Annie Besant, one of India’s greatest benefactors as reviver of that Self-knowledge and Self-respect which are the indispensable preliminaries of true Self-government, began her public life, fifty years ago, as a Socialist and one of the founders of the famous Fabian Society of Britain. She remained a Socialist at heart ever after. She returned to it on the higher level of Theosophy towards the close of her life. In 1927, she delivered in London, a series of four lectures, subsequently published in book-form as *The New Civilisation*, in which

she stated her ideas on what 'the new Religion,' 'the new Education,' 'the new Economics,' should be.

Mahatma Gandhi, the greatest mover of the Indian Mass-Mind, in modern times, has declared (in a public statement, at Ahmedabad, on 30-6-1934, to a local group of Socialists) that "if the masses organise and take charge of the State for the attainment of the *Socialism he had in view*, he would *welcome* such a consummation . . . and would certainly be glad if Congress *Socialists of the right type* take charge of the Congress". He has expressed the same views repeatedly since, but has not had the opportunity of telling the public fully what is "the Socialism he has in view" and whom he considers "Socialists of the right type". He has said that the ideas embodied in the Karachi Congress Resolution, of 1931, on Fundamental Rights and Duties and the nature of the Constitution needed by India, are "as far as he is prepared to go at present". But that resolution, while undoubtedly visualising a very great advance upon the principles, or rather lack of principles, expressed by the existing conditions, falls far short of a complete and consistent Scheme of Social Organisation.

Two prominent members of the Liberal Party in India, one of them a large capitalist, in the course of a joint statement, dated 30-5-1934, at Bombay, admit that "Socialism on sound lines may be the salvation of the world," but do not say what "Socialism on sound lines" is; instead, they say that "this is not the time nor the place to explain a clear-cut distinction between Socialism and Communism"; though the public may well think that there is no other time or place when or where such explanation can be more urgently needed.

Socialist views have been spreading for some years now, among the educated, thoughtful, patriotic, members of the middle-aged and the younger generations of India, deeply anxious for her future fate, poignantly feeling the shame of her fallen condition, eager to undergo every self-sacrifice if they can thereby help to lift her up. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, an ex-President of the Congress, at present a political prisoner, is a leading protagonist of the Indian Socialists; and an All-India Congress Socialists Conference, held at Patna on 17-5-1934, has put forward a programme for immediate use and action, (without a complete and consistent theory or scheme as yet), which is arousing controversy, and is receiving critical attention,

as it should, from Mahatma Gandhi and others.

In view of all these facts, this booklet, indicating, and inviting public attention to, the principles of the Ancient Scientific Socialism of India may not be inopportune or wholly without use.

Benares

BHAGAVAN DAS

1 September, 1934

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Rshis-Auliyās who are holding back the Forces of Darkness	1
The Abyss	4
The Way of avoiding it	5
The First Object of the T.S., and a Fresh Technique of Social Organisation	5
The Ancient Indian Technique and the New Ones .	6
Some Apparently Good Features of Bolshevism .	9
The Grave Defects of Bolshevik Communism .	11
Conflicting Reports <i>ré</i> Bolshevism and Fascism .	13
The Three Fundamental Instincts; their Sublimation	21
Essential Religion <i>vs.</i> Priestcraft	23
The Second Object of the T.S.	26
'Scientific Socialism' founded on 'Mysticism' .	26
Righteous Property <i>vs.</i> Capitalist Swindling .	30
The Ancient Socialism and the Modern	31
The Radical Fallacy of Current Economics .	33
Capitalism and World-Confusion	39
Reconciliation of Differing "Isms"	46
The Radical Cure for the Radical Defects	50
How to Deal with Inevitable War	52
The Maltreatment of the Three Instincts by Capitalism	55
The Family-Home as Moral Laboratory and Arche- type of the Socialist State	57

	PAGE
Socialist Insect Communities	60
Manu's Organismic Society	61
The Family Ideal <i>vs.</i> Marriage Degeneration	63
The Golden Mean	63
The Four Separate Functions and Powers in Society	65
One Middle Class instead of Two Extreme Classes, <i>viz.</i> , the Too-Rich Few and the Too-Poor Many	67
Four Main Guilds	69
An Objection and the Reply	73
The Individualist Peasant as Bulwark of Private Property	74
The Three Goddesses Worshipped in all Times and Climes	77
Classlessness <i>vs.</i> Vocational Classes	79
Society First, State Afterwards	80
The Class-Structure of Society and the Philosophies of Communism and Fascism	84
The Ancient Scientific Guild Socialism or the Four Guilds State	103
Some Concrete Suggestions	112
The Third Object of the T.S.	140
Self-Sacrifice	141
Psychological Vices of Democracies and their one Fatal Weakness	142
The Only Cure—A Class of Missionaries of God and Ministers of Men	151
Wanted—a Real School of Yoga	154
Help Them Who are holding back the forces of darkness	157
Conclusion	163
Appendix	165

ANCIENT VERSUS MODERN
“SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM”
OR
THEOSOPHY
AND
CAPITALISM, FASCISM, COMMUNISM

*The Rshis-Auliyas who are Holding
Back the Forces of Darkness*

NEARLY fifty years ago, the Masters, whom Theosophists believe in, almost pleaded for help and appealed for recruits: “Try to lift a little of the heavy Karma of the world; give your aid to the few strong hands that hold the powers of darkness back from obtaining complete victory.”¹

Only they (the Masters, Rshis, Maharshis, Auliyas, Abrārs, Abdāls) can say what the history of the human world since then, the rapid growth of the causes which led to the World-War, the outbreak

¹ *Light on the Path*. For full quotations re the Masters' efforts for the politico-economical uplift of India see Bhagavan Das, *Annie Besant and the Changing World*.

of that War, the vast upheavals, the changes of ideas and ideals side by side with the persistence of the war-mentality, the social rearrangements, the unabating maniacal madness of fierce mutual distrust, fear, hatred, between the civilised nations, the relentless still-growing exploitation of the weaker by the stronger, the spirit of mutual terrorism and civil war increasing everywhere though as yet kept in check by the memories of the horrors and the consequences of the last War—all the things that have taken and are taking place in China, Japan, Russia, Turkey, India, Italy, Germany, U. S. A., South America, Africa—only they can say what it all signifies. Does it mean the success of those powers of darkness? Does it mean their defeat? Does it mean a compromise, partial success and partial defeat? Has the War brought any relief to the over-burdened earth, as the Mahā-bhāraṭa War did? Or has it made the burden worse? Have the Militarists of this era destroyed the breeding powers of each other really, to any considerable extent, as those of the Mahā-bhāraṭa period did, or are they multiplying more profusely with spawning capacities uninjured? Have the Capitalist-gamblers of to-day, who, exploiting the ignorance, passions, prejudices, sentiments and emotions of ‘nationalism,’ of their respective peoples, with truly Satanic cunning, inveigled all the nations into the War, to promote their own financial interests—have they really

after all overshoot their mark and undermined each other, as the King-gamblers of the Mahā-bhārata time did, and as seems to be indicated by the tariff-war, the world-wide economic depression, the refusal of the debtor-nations (including Britain, the wealthiest) to pay their debt-instalments, and the consequent deadlock between them and the creditor-nations (or rather, ultimately, only the U. S. A. whose capitalists profited most by the War, and which now finds herself in the grip of her *debtors*, a complete reversal of the process ruling hitherto, and hence portentous of a new era!)? Or will these capitalists manage to extricate themselves from the *impasse* by the approved old methods of the trickster and the bully, and go on grinding the faces of the vast masses of the poor, worse than ever before? Will the work of the Great War have to be completed by another and worse Armageddon, as seems likely, and as the work of the Mahā-bhārata War was completed by the Yāḍava annihilation? Or will the politicians and the economists learn in time that common sense which has become the most uncommon commodity to-day, the common sense which says that hatred does not cease by hatred but by love, that fear and distrust breed greater fear and distrust, that strife makes more strife? Only the Seers can say.

But we of the T. S. have to ask, and answer to, ourselves: Has the T. S. really served any part of the purpose it was intended to serve, throughout

this past vast turmoil? Has it in any the feeblest way helped in holding back the forces of darkness? If so, how far?

The conscience of some of us, at least, is not quite easy. We have often wondered if theosophists should not have led pacifist movements in all their respective belligerent countries, and suffered the pains and penalties of conscientious objectors, and thereby released some, however small, additional influence for sanity and brotherliness in the world's moral, mental, superphysical, atmosphere. We have left others to do our duty. But it is never too late to mend.

The Abyss

The Human Race seems, it appears to some, (or, if we may judge by the news about the Disarmament Conference, and the cries uttered on every side of the imminent danger of another and worse World-War and the consequent sure and certain destruction of all civilisation, then to most), to have been rushing towards a fathomless abyss, despite the grandeur, or the gaud and glare, of the life of the vast capital cities, for the last three-quarters of a century; that is to say, ever since western science discovered the *half-truths* of the selfish '*struggle for existence*' and the '*materialist interpretation of history*,' and in its purblind hurry passed by, or even deliberately thrust aside, the

other and far more important and helpful *half-truths* of the unselfish 'alliance for existence' and the 'idealist or spiritual interpretation of history,' which make the very existence, the nourishment and growth, and the progress in the arts of civilisation, of the new generations possible, and of which greater half-truths every selfless mother and every great public-spirited humanist, or even merely patriotic, leader, discoverer, inventor, educator, poet, prophet, of every nation is proof patent.

The Way of Avoiding It

All that is needed to save the Race from that abyss seems to have been indicated by the Real Founders of the T. S. in its Three Objects. But those objects have to be made living.

The First Object and a Fresh Technique of Social Organisation

1. The First Object of the Theosophical Society is: To form a nucleus of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color.

1. It is not enough to subjectively and sentimentally *feel* Universal Brotherhood. Nor is it enough even to see that the Golden Rule of Ethics, particularly connected now with the name of Christ, but enunciated by the scriptures of all the

great religions, describes the *practice* of which Universal Brotherhood is the *theory*. It is necessary to work out a fresh *Technique*, a modified old or a wholly new *Scheme of Social Organisation*, a scheme of administration of all the affairs of the *individual* as well as the *collective* human life. This Technique must be such as would make it *possible* for the Golden Rule to become objectively and actually operative, as would make Universal Brotherhood *practicable*, would make it *feasible* to change Society, under the existing industrial, mechanical and urban conditions (assuming, as we must, that they cannot be wholly abolished so as to leave behind only pastoral, agricultural, and rural ones) from its present basis of grossly iniquitous and excessively individualist capitalism and the subservient militarism and imperialism, to the basis of a really *equitable* (not any impossible *equal* or *exactly similar*) *sharing*, by all and each, in the world's work as well as the world's good things, its necessities, comforts, luxuries and enjoyments.

The Ancient Indian Technique and the New Ones

The T. S. should work out such a scheme in the light of Theosophy and offer it for consideration to the world at large. Manu has given us such a technique in his permanent (and not merely five-year or ten-year or twenty-five-year) Plan of the Individual Life and the Social Life in combination,

for the whole of the Human Race—the only systematic and complete Plan, (acted on also for millennia in India, though very defectively and perversely), that was known to history until Russian Communism was born, which Communism is in the stage of experiment as yet. In that Plan are included the fundamental Principles of Planned Education, Planned Family-life, Planned Economy, Planned Defence-Sanitation-Judication, and Planned Religion-Recreation-Art. It professes to solve the Individual-problem and the World-problem or Society-problem in connection with each other, since Individual and Society are obviously inseparable, and “each has to be for all and all have to be for each”.¹ Some of us believe that the *fundamental principles* laid down by Manu are sound guides still, though his details have, many of them, obviously become inapplicable in the new conditions. Those principles have only to be applied with discrimination. But there are perhaps many members of the T. S. who do not think so. They should think out fresh principles, in the light of Theosophy, after carefully considering the pros and cons of the tremendous experiments that are afoot, especially in Russia and Italy, and put their views before the general public, through the *Theosophist* which goes into all countries, and the other organs of the T. S., as

¹ See Bhagavan Das, *The Science of Social Organisation, or the Laws of Manu*.

well as the general press. The T. S. might organise small committees which, for this purpose, would study 'on the spot,' in Russia, Italy, Germany, also U. S. A., the operations of what we know as Bolshevism or Communism and also Fascism in its varying forms; and especially in France (and also Czecho-slovakia) the operation of principles (not deliberately and systematically adopted, but operating sub-consciously as it were) of social structure, "a better and more healthy social system," whereby large and small industry, agriculture, intellectual, scientific, and artistic occupations, public services, capital, labor, all are on the whole well-balanced, with the result of a more equitable "distribution of wealth" and a more widely spread "general well-being" than in any other country, even Britain the richest.¹

Each of such committees should be composed of persons with different sympathies and biases, some inclining towards Communism, others towards Fascism, yet others towards some other form of Socialism, (and there are quite a number of such, and mutually strongly conflicting, forms being advocated to-day) or modified Capitalism. But of course all must have open minds, and, even more, friendly hearts; and they should carry out their travels and their investigations jointly, in constant company. So their joint reports would be balanced

¹ Major Barnes, *Fascism*, pp. 168-170 (pub. 1931) and Cole, *Europe Today*, pp. 224-233, 299-314, 602-610 (pub. 1933).

and trustworthy, would set forth the pros and cons of each of the two great "isms" impartially, and would suggest, in the light of Theosophy, *i.e.*, of the Psychology of Human Nature and the Philosophy of Human Life, what features of each are really helpful and worthy of being accepted by all countries and populations, in so far as they have common human dispositions and requirements, and what corrections and supplementations, or substitutions, they need.

Some Apparently Good Features of Bolshevism

To one who, like the present writer, derives his knowledge about these great experiments and their results only from books and papers, it seems that there are a good many features in Bolshevism which are worthy of imitation by all States, and which are thoroughly in keeping with, are even derivable from, nay, are even possible to maintain permanently only on, the principles of Manu; *e.g.*, planned agricultural and industrial production and distribution for consumption rather than profit; planned and purposeful vocational as well as cultural education for every boy and girl; planned birth-regulation and provision for maternity and child-welfare; planned defence; planned distribution of population; planned medical help; parks of rest and culture for all, in the big towns; cheap and expeditious adjudication; utilisation

of the talents of women for the public good, and provision of useful public and private new interests and social functions for all such of them as have special tastes and abilities, and time to spare from domestic duties; dozens of new planned towns, created within the last ten years, with appropriate architecture, housing, sanitation, places and means of culture and recreation, and populations already running into five and even six figures; many more such being projected, in distant parts of Siberia; old cities being re-planned and greatly improved; occupational or functional representation in the Soviets and legislatures; indirect election, since areas and populations are very large; and abolition of illiteracy, unemployment, prostitution, beggary and other such evils.¹

But there are also some very serious defects in it, in regard to which Fascism seems to stand on surer ground, though Fascism has other grave faults of its own.

It should be noted that only the general theories and broad applications are being spoken of. The practice, in detail, of both Russian Communism or Bolshevism and Fascism has had and still has many features which are (if we may believe apparently trustworthy narrations) nearly or

¹ See *Twelve Studies in Russia*, by twelve specialist investigators, edited by M. I. Cole, (pub. 1933)—a book which seems to carry marks of trustworthiness on its face; also *A Scientist among the Soviets*, by Julian Huxley, (1932); and *Modern Russia, the Land of Planning*, by Louis Segal, (1933).

even quite as vicious, repulsive, tyrannical, as those of any Capitalist-Imperialist State.

The Grave Defects of Bolshevik Communism

It is said that "Religion, private Property and business, and the individualistic Family—the three fundamental institutions of the human world so far—are in present-day Russia the three chief villains or clowns," that "the Soviets are creating a strange and formidable human being to whom all the old familiar words, Religion and Freedom, Wealth, Home and Family, are losing their significance, and whose body and mind have but one purpose, to serve the aim and the will of the new Society";¹ and this 'aim and will,' so far as can be gathered, are strictly limited to the securing of the sense-requirements of the earthly life of the material man, for his mental, emotional, artistic requirements are all conceived in terms of the physical senses, and all belief in things superphysical and spiritual, in the existence of a soul apart from this body, in any after-life, in other worlds, etc., is taboo.

Theosophical investigators should be able to report reliably to what extent, if at all, such statements are true; and also whether they are true, and if so how far, of each of the three (or rather the four unavoidable, natural) 'classes'

¹ Maurice Hindus, *The Great Offensive* (pub. 1933).

into which Russia, despite all the desperate efforts to make it 'class-less,' has again helplessly differentiated, *viz.*, the registered Communists proper (the Ruling Class, including practically all the Officials and the *Krasno-arme-yetz* or Red-Army-Men, the new name for Soldiers), the Proletarians (sub-divided into the Manual Workers and the Intellectual Workers), and the *Muzhiks* or Peasants (Farmers, Cattle-breeders, Traders in farm-produce).

It will probably be found that none of these three, or rather four, classes has as yet wholly dispensed with the Religious instinct or the Family instinct or the Property-instinct, though the expression of them may have taken other forms; and that even these new forms are largely confined to the comparatively small urban sections, *i.e.*, the Communists proper, some three millions, or slightly more than 2 p.c., and the Proletarians, some seventeen millions, or a little less than 10 p.c., of the total Russian population of over one hundred and sixty millions.

Fascism, in contrast with Communism, is said to recognise these instincts, to even encourage them, except that it seeks, very rightly, or at least professes, to curb the excesses of Capital. Whether it does so actually, and whether it is purifying and rationalising religion and sex-relations, is far from clear.

Bolshevism too, despite all its professions of adherence to the cult of economic equality. is said

to permit differences in salaries and incomes ranging from 45 to 1,500 roubles per month, in the ranks of Communists and Proletarians,¹ on the one hand, and on the other, to place very heavy burdens of taxation on the vast majority of the population, *viz.*, the *muzhiks* or peasants, and subject them to shortage of food and other necessities, while the two (or three) other classes are kept in clover. The *muzhiks*, despite the fact that they form 85 p.c. of the population, have no effective representation in the Soviets and no voice in the matter of taxation; they are mulcted at will by the Communists in power, *i.e.*, the Dictator.

Conflicting Reports re Bolshevism and Fascism

There are conflicting, nay, flatly contradictory, reports, some wholly eulogistic, some entirely condemnatory, made from time to time about both Bolshevik Communism and Fascism by observers who claim first-hand knowledge and are apparently competent. The trends of those regarding Communism, have been indicated above. As regards Fascism too, there are reported, on the one

¹ *Twelve Studies in Russia*, pp. 70-72, 90-91, 231, 271. "Even now, authors and playwrights... are among the *richest* people in Russia. ... They are paid on a basis of royalties. ... *Each* theatre (which produces a play) pays the author a definite percentage of its receipts;" *The Great Offensive*, p. 220. An incidental consequence is that the richest are not the best but the most 'catching' writers. (Op. cit., p. 212.) But mercenarising the Educator is a *very dangerous* proceeding.

hand, great reclamations of vast areas from marshes, new settlements consisting of myriads of new-built houses, great improvements in home industries, *not by direct State-management but through Corporations controlled by the State*, decision of disputes between Capital and Labor by arbitration or State Courts and mostly on terms favorable to Labor, stimulus to general and technical education, formation of After-Work Labor Associations for the spread of culture among the working people, provision for Maternity and Infant-welfare, and so on.¹ It is said (by a theosophist) that "Italy, after passing through a state of terror and repression as well as of dangerous nationalism, seems to be settling down to become a really fine, united, and idealistic nation".² There is also the fact, which has its own significance, that some of the highest officers of State of some of the most powerful other countries, including even the Prime Minister of Britain, have been visiting Signor Mussolini from time to time to learn his views and consult his wishes on world-politics; and even Communist Russia has concluded a pact of mutual non-aggression with Fascist Italy, and, of course, with several Capitalist States and others also. People court the rising sun. On the other hand, it is said (by

¹ P. N. Roy, "Eleven Years of Fascism," in *The Modern Review*, for January, 1934.

² L. G. Bendit, in the *Theosophist* for Dec., 1933.

another theosophist) that "This new tyranny, Fascism, stripped of its symbols and pseudo-mysticism—the dope so useful for the bemusing of simple men and the enslavement of still more simple women—is nothing but a junta of capitalists riding the State".¹ Other writers say, "Fascism has been able to reduce the working classes once more to the level at which they stood a century ago. . . . Fascism, Dictatorship, Corporations, this is all nonsense—the reality is that the Fascist Corporate State is a Police State. . . . 20 p.c. of the workers are unemployed".² The vaunted new prosperity is said to be all a sham and a delusion, mostly bluff and advertisement, and the newspapers publish figures (which at least there appears little reason to doubt) of vast national debts owed to foreign capitalists, mostly American, and huge deficits in the annual budgets. "Italy . . . where Mussolini juggled the budget of State and Municipalities so that every economist was puzzled—although not one believed the budget was balanced—was able to borrow so many billions of lire from the too-rich American international bankers that she too made the world think her prosperous."³ If, on the one hand, "the Communist

¹ Major D. Graham Pole, in *The Modern Review* for October, 1933.

² A writer in the *New Statesman* (England) quoted in the *Leader* (Allahabad) of 25-4-1934.

³ George Seldes, *World Panorama, 1918-1933*, p. 270 (pub. 1933).

solution seems simple but means the complete subordination of the individual to the State and the destruction of his personality," according to one writer,¹ on the other hand, Mussolini himself has written, "Both in Russia and in Italy it has been demonstrated that it is possible to govern outside, above, and against all liberal ideas. Neither Communism nor Fascism has anything in common with liberty. Fascism is not afraid to declare itself illiberal or anti-liberal. It has already passed, and, if necessary, will again pass without the slightest hesitation, over the body, more or less decomposed, of the Goddess of Liberty."²

These remarks of Mussolini seem to be wholly true. The 'ideologies' of the two systems are different, as regards religion, private property, and family, but the practice, in detail, of 'strong' government is exactly the same in the case of both, as indeed of all despotic governments, capitalist and imperialist pre-eminently. "Everything within the State, nothing outside the State, nothing against the State"—is the dictum of Mussolini. Very good—if righteously interpreted and worked in the sense that all human beings are parts of one macrocosmic organism, as expounded by the ancient Indian Lawgiver. Very dangerous—if it

¹ Major Oliver Stanley, British Minister of Transport, in a speech at Manchester in October, 1933.

² George Seldes, *World Panorama, 1918—1933*, p. 142.

means in act-uality, "I, Mussolini, (like Louis le Grand), am the State"; dangerous, because Mussolini may be benevolent to-day, but there is no guarantee that he will not become malevolent to-morrow. Even so, Lenin said, "The whole of Society will become one office and one factory"¹—more prosy and less rhapsodical language, no doubt, but expressive of the same basic idea and liable to the same right and wrong interpretations and dangers in practice, with only one man, Lenin or Stalin or another, as "boss" of the whole office and the whole factory.

Whole sentences, occurring in enthusiastic descriptions of the successes achieved by the two systems respectively, may be transferred from the one to the other intact without interfering with the flow of the narrative; yet the two are utterly antagonistic in theories and basic principles. In his pamphlet, *The Political and Social Doctrine of Fascism*, Mussolini says: "Fascism is the complete opposite of that doctrine, the base of so-called scientific and Marxian Socialism, the materialist conception of history (p. 13) . . . It combats the whole complex system of democratic ideology, . . . denies that the majority . . . can direct human society. (p. 14.) . . . It denies, in democracy, the absurd conventional untruth of political equality dressed out in the garb of collective irresponsibility. (p. 16.) . . . It is in complete

¹ M. Hindus, *Humanity Uprooted*, p. 64.

opposition to the doctrines of Liberalism." (p. 16.) He also says, "But the Fascist negation of Socialism, Democracy, and Liberalism must not be taken to mean that Fascism desires to lead the world back to the state of affairs before 1789"; also that "A Party (*i.e.*, the Fascist) which entirely governs a nation is a fact entirely new in history; there are no possible references or parallels" (p. 19); and on the very next page he says, "No doctrine has ever been completely new"; also that "if the nineteenth century was a century of individualism—Liberalism always signifying individualism—it may be expected that this will be the century of *collectivism*". (p. 20.)

The reader will readily see the inaccuracies and inconsistencies in these statements. Lenin and the Communist Party began to "entirely govern" Russia five years before the advent of Mussolini and the Fascist Party; and, apart from stickling and quibbling over words, every despotic government—and history is mostly filled with such—has been the "entire government" of "entire nations" by the despot's "Party" or "Staff". So far as "collectivism" is concerned, the quoted sentence seems to imply that Mussolini is introducing it in Italy; but there appears no trace of it there, and it belongs to Russia exclusively as yet. As to Democracy, Communism professes to practise "functional" representation; and, so did Fascism till 1st July, 1934. In practice, the members of

the elected Soviets are mostly only Communists, and of the Italian Chamber of Deputies were only Fascists; and from the 1st July, Mussolini has abolished even that show, *viz.*, the Chamber of Deputies, and governs through a Ministry of Corporations, the nominal figure-head of the State being the King, as Russia is governed by the Cabinet of Commissars under Stalin, the official (figure-head?) President being Kalenin. It is very much the same to-day in the other Dictator-countries; and, if the Sedition Bill which is now (July, 1934) before the House of Commons of Britain is passed, will become the same in Britain, the Prime Minister and the Cabinet ('advised' by the Bureaucracy) becoming omnipotent. Briefly, Mussolini's claims to originality are very questionable. Even the new form of the idea of the Absolute State is a century-old German idea propounded by Hegel and developed later by Trietchke. The "divine right of the king," has become "the divine right of the State," *i.e.*, the Dictator, who fulfils the nation's "need of authority, of direction, of order" (Mussolini's pamphlet, p. 26) to his own heart's content.

To illustrate the contradictory nature of reports about Fascism, two more quotations from current literature may be made. An Indian visitor to Italy in 1933, Prof. P. N. Roy, writes in *The Modern Review* for January, 1934: "Apart from the fact that there are no things in the world which

might not be criticised in certain aspects, it must be admitted that the Fascist Government has been a great success in Italy, a success which she has not known for many centuries. . . . Fascism is intensely practical and at the same time intensely idealistic. . . . The family instinct is strong in him (the Italian peasant). . . . The proprietary instinct is also strong in him. . . . He has reverence for his Church . . . and celebrates religious festivals with the same sincerity as the Indian peasant. . . . During the eleven years of its existence Fascism has placed Italy in a sound economic position." On the other hand, Mr. Wilfred Wellock, ex-M. P., a well-known publicist, writing (in the same *Review*, for July, 1934,) a concentrated and powerful indictment of the Capitalism which is deliberately creating scarcity by destroying food-stuffs to raise prices, and is unscrupulously and relentlessly trying to plunge the world into another Armageddon, in order to promote the manufacture and sale of war-material, all for its own profit, begins thus: "Governments are blundering towards another war, and Fascism threatens to engulf the greater part of the world." Later on he says, "Freedom, variety, individuality, color, art, etc., are out of date in the Fascist State. . . . One thing only does Fascism guarantee, the privileges of the rich, even at the expense of *the poor, whose poverty Fascism increases*. . . . In Fascist Italy, Germany, Austria, thousands of newspapers have ceased

publication, while tens of thousands of books and pamphlets have been burned. . . . In the Fascist State every child born is a little Ditto. . . . The *Idea* has got to be crushed." He concludes thus, "Let the fact be made crystal clear that to defend Capitalism now is to lend a hand in establishing the greatest monstrosity in the history of civilisation—a Fascist State, and eventually an imbecile world."

Between such contradictions, the theosophical investigators should be able to present a trustworthy report to the readers of the *Theosophist*, upon which report action for education of public opinion could be based by members in their respective countries.

*The Three Fundamental Instincts or Appetites
of the Human Being; their Sublimation*

All theosophists would probably agree that the instinct for Food (whence self-preservation); for private possessions or Property (whence self-expansion), for Spouse (whence self-multiplication), are inherent in the embodied soul, so long as it is treading the Path of Pursuit; that all three are inseparable from the sense of separate Individuality, egoism, *aham-kāra*, *kḥudī*; grow with its growth, decay with its decay; and should be carefully regulated and given play to the extent, and only to the extent, to which it is necessary and desirable to foster that sense. Religion is Spiritual Hunger, the psychical counterpart of physical

hunger. It is the desire for Spiritual Food, for the self-preservation of the Spirit, deathlessly, eternally; as physical hunger is for physical food, for the preservation of the body as long as possible. Even so, Curiosity, the intellectual hunger for intellectual food, is the desire for the self-preservation of the mental body, another aspect of the psyche, soul, *jīva, rūh*.¹

These three Fundamental Appetites are recognised in the literatures of all the nations and all the religions living to-day.² Their misuse is the cause of all the greatest miseries of man; their right use, of all his greatest joys. The Ancient Scientific Socialism regulates and refines them, nay, sanctifies, sacri-fic-ates, consecrates them; for it sublimates them into the 'religious' pursuit of the triple-end of the first two quarters of the human lifetime, its first two Āshramas, *viz.*, the triple-end of Dharma-Artha-Kāma, Lawful-Religion, Lawful-Property, Lawful-Family-life-and-Enjoyment; and thereby, makes them the means of the discharge, by each human being, of the threefold Social Debt (to the Ancestors, to the Teachers, to the Nature-forces), laden with which he is born into and lives in this world.³

¹ Fuller considerations about these three fundamental appetites and their correspondence with cognition-action-desire and other psycho-physical triads will be found in *The Science of the Emotions* by the present writer.

² Bhagavan Das, *The Essential Unity of Religions*, pp. 149-152.

³ Bhagavan Das, *The Science of Social Organisation, or The Laws of Manu*, Ch. I.

Essential Religion vs. Priestcraft

All should, of course, fight against and endeavour to annihilate priestcraft, by all means ; but none should attempt the futility, and disastrous futility, of fighting against Essential Religion, for Religion means the craving of the Finite for, and the resting of it in, the arms of the Infinite, the communion of the Mortal with the Immortal, the stretching and mergence of Physics into Superphysics and Metaphysics. H. P. Blavatsky quotes Guizot, the famous historian-statesman of France, as saying, "Belief in the supernatural" (we would now say superphysical and metaphysical) "is an act natural, primitive, universal, and constant in the life and history of the human race. Unbelief in the supernatural begets materialism ; materialism, sensuality ; sensuality, social convulsions, amid whose storms man again learns to believe and pray".¹ It is eternally true that "man does not live by physical bread alone". The craving for spiritual bread, the yearning of the heart, the mind, the soul, to probe the mystery of the origin, the character, the purpose of the world-process, the meaning of Nature, of the human being's own existence and life and death, is more deep-rooted and more indefeasible. In the enthusiasm (mark the contradiction, "*en-thus-iasm*," etymologically, means *en-theos-iasm*, *God-inspiration* !)

¹ *Isis Unveiled*, I, p. 293.

of the righteous struggle against the excesses and oppressions of Capitalism, and of the gigantic and all-absorbing endeavour to carry out the Five-Year-Plans, the new Russia may not be feeling that higher craving, for the moment; but that craving—or, in its stead, maniacal madness—will come later with redoubled intensity.¹ As well say, “Don’t take thought about to-morrow’s food-supply” as say “Don’t think about the after-life.” The T. S., if it is to justify its existence, should be able to supply this spiritual bread, this Essential Religion, to all Mankind, in the shape of that Theosophy which is the heart of all religions and therefore can reconcile them all. Fact is much, no doubt, but fancy is more; prose is very good, but poetry is better; solid stone gives a firm base, but the invisible air gives life; canvas is valuable, but the painting on it by the master is invaluable; earth is necessary, but heaven is more

¹ As to how, for the time being, Russia is satisfying her soul-hunger with a new “religion” which has “a faith, a ceremonial, a morality, even a theology, partly doctrine, an authority—Marx and Lenin are respectively the Old and New Testaments of Bolshevik Russia—recantations, public cleansings (instead of private confessionals), crusade, sense of sin, but no supernatural and no prayer”—see M. Hindus, *The Great Offensive*, Ch. XI.

“Human nature is like universal nature in its abhorrence of a vacuum. It feels an intuitional yearning for a Supreme Power . . . Mankind has one innate irrepressible craving that must be satisfied . . . This is the yearning after the proofs of immortality”; *Isis Unveiled*, I, 36.

necessary. To stifle this craving of the human heart for the caressing touch of the Eternal, "the love of the moth for the Star," is indeed to murder the soul, to break the golden thread which (in theosophical terminology) connects the lower with the higher principles of man and is the means of his achieving personal immortality.

On the other hand, priestcraft or the perversion of religion is, if possible, worse than the Communist abolition of religion. "... The greatest, the chief, cause of nearly two-thirds of the evils that pursue humanity ever since that cause became a power . . . is [pseudo-] religion, under whatever form, or in whatever nation; it is sacerdotal caste, the priesthood, and the churches . . . Ignorance created gods and cunning took advantage of the opportunity. Look at India, look at Christendom and Islam, at Judaism and Feticism. It is priestly imposture that rendered these gods so terrible to man; it is [pseudo-] religion that makes him the selfish bigot, the fanatic that hates all mankind out of his own sect, without rendering him any better or more moral for it . . . [and] makes of two-thirds of humanity the slaves of those who deceived them under the false pretence of saving them."¹

It is therefore the incumbent duty of the T. S. to struggle *against* Priestcraft and *for* Essential Religion.

¹ *The Early Teachings of the Masters, 1881-1883*, p. 234.

The Second Object

II. The Second Object of the T. S. is: To encourage the study of comparative religion, philosophy, and science.

II. Here comes the need for making the pursuit of the Second Object a living pursuit. Members of the T. S., wearing the garments of different creeds outwardly, but feeling within themselves the pulsing of the common theosophical heart, should collaborate in order to make plain to the general public, of all creeds, the utter *agreement* between the scriptures of them all, on all *fundamental matters*, underneath the differences of language and of non-essentials. H. P. B.'s great books are beacon-lights for this pursuit.¹

*'Scientific Socialism' helplessly Founded on
Mysticism and Idealism*

Such pursuit of the Second Object will help very greatly in the carrying out of the first. It will help to establish peace between the creeds, in theory, and, in practice, will emphasise the Golden Rule, in the setting of a really Scientific Socialism, as common to all creeds. This real Scientific Socialism can be described only partly in the terms

¹ See also Annie Besant, *The Universal Text-Book of Religion and Morals*, and Bhagavan Das, *The Essential Unity of All Religions*.

of Marx and Engels and Lenin, and for the rest must be expounded and completed in terms of theological psychological science, which corrects and supplements the former in very important respects.

The 'Materialist Interpretation of History' which Marx propounds, is, as said before, the lesser half of the truth. The 'Spiritualist, Idealist, Hero-ist Interpretation of History' is the greater half of it. "To Lenin, too, humanity seemed to cry out for deliverance. Humanity is an abstraction, a moral conception difficult to define. All philosophic *materialists* become *mystics* when they speak of it . . . Everyone has a different impression of the Duty called Humanity. The pilgrim Ulianov (Lenin) believed that it called for Sacrifice."¹ It seems that not only to Lenin but to everyone to whom "Duty is called Humanity," it inevitably calls for Sacrifice. *Prajā*, Humanity, and *Yajña*, Sacrifice, are created together, and by means of one another, by the Creator; (*Gitā*.) "In his book, *Where to Begin?*, Lenin says, 'Without ten leaders of talent—and talents are not born by the hundred—proved, trained to their task, schooled in it through long years, it is impossible in present-day society for any class to carry on any sort of energetic struggle' . . . The arms and brains of *exceptional individuals* become the weapons of an *idea* which is the beginning of a *reality*.'"²

¹ Valeriu Marcu, *Lenin*, pp. 81-2, 92, 97

² *Ibid.*

Why, on the 'materialist interpretation of history,' is talent born only by the ten (scarcely even that) and not by the hundred? Why are there any "exceptional individuals"? What, on that interpretation, is Humanity? Is it not a mere abstraction, a mere conception? Why should any 'individual' voluntarily make any 'self-sacrifice' for it? Why should any one cultivate the 'will-to-equality' rather than the 'will-to-superiority'? What exactly is an 'Individual,' and what is 'Society' or 'Community'? Is *self-sacrifice* materialist, rationalist, or is it mystical, theosophical?

Such scrutiny will lead us to see that while the old and changing Time *brings* the new Man, the new Man *makes* the new Time, epoch, era, which, of course, will, in turn, by excess corrupt itself, and require another new Man to correct it, till the end of Time, or at least of the Human Race, by all indications. It will also show us that the genuine psychologically 'Scientific' Socialism is also part, and essential part, of all religions, inasmuch as they all accentuate, in their daily *prayers*, the *Gayatrī*, the *Namāz*, the Lord's Prayer, the 'We'-feeling, but without any futile attempt at eradication of the 'I'-feeling, which would annihilate the 'We'-feeling simultaneously. "Unless behind your fellow, and yourself, and in both, you see God" (the Universal Self), "you will not catch the enthusiasm of Humanity".¹ Buddha,

¹ Seth, *Ethical Principles*, p. 210.

Christ, and other Religious Reformers, have all been genuine Socialists, condemning the excessive accumulation of worldly riches, and pioneering associations of monks and nuns who shared alike.¹

Therefore *genuine self-sacrificing Socialists*, with the 'will-to-equitability,' despite all their professions and pretensions of rationalist and materialist interpretations, *are perforce real mystics* at heart in the best and most active sense; therefore is *genuine Socialism* helplessly rooted in *genuine Religion*. For Socialism to quarrel with Mysticism is to deny its parent. There is no Socialism possible without Universal Brotherhood; and there is no Universal Brotherhood possible without the Universal Self—the recognition of which is the acme of Mysticism. Essential, Universal, Religion is the best and firmest, nay the only permanent, foundation of real Rational Socialism.²

¹ These associations failed economically and morally because they were not governed by any such Technique of Socio-Individual life as was provided by Manu, who seems to be rather against a rigidly organised "Church" and cenobitic communities, monasteries, nunneries, etc. The lack of regulated personal incentive caused the economic failure; (see Gibbon, *Roman Empire*, ch. xxvii, and Leacock, *Political Science*, Pt. III, ch. ii, "Socialism"); premature celibacy and retirement from the world, and seeking of "company" instead of "solitude," caused the moral failure. That India has been falling despite the possession of Manu's System, is due to neglect of the principles of that system through degeneration of character and *vice versa*; that she is still alive is due to the remnants of observance of those principles.

² Discussing why Socialism is not progressing as it should, G. B. Shaw says, "The difficulties are not . . . in the *practical* part of the business . . . but in the *metaphysical* part, i.e., in

‘ I ’ and ‘ Mine,’ and ‘ We ’ and ‘ Our ’ ;
Righteous Property vs. Capitalist Swindling

The legitimate shoot and fruit of this seed of ‘ I ’-feeling, *aham-tā*, Individuality, without the due, and not more than due, fostering and development of which it dies without fulfilling its destiny, is ‘ My ’-feeling, *mama-tā*, the wish for a separate home, homestead, belongings, private possessions—during the time that the human being is Pursuant of and in this world, and has not become a Renunciant anchoret, *faqīr*, *sannyāsī*. But of course this ‘ I ’-feeling and ‘ my ’-feeling which are the heart of Individuality, must be subordinated to the ‘ We ’-feeling and ‘ Our ’-feeling which constitute the soul of Society.

Recognising this principle, just as we have to fight *against* priestcraft and *for* real religion, so we have to educate public opinion, and (if not as a Theosophical Society, for any good reasons, then each member in his individual capacity)

‘ the will-to-equality ’ ; *Guide to Socialism*, p. 298. But he does not seem to realise that the metaphysical difficulty, ultimately, is, on the one hand, the lack of the sensing of the Universal Self, and, on the other, the impossibility of the will-to-complete-equality during evolution which necessarily means differentiation, due to the multiplicity of the Not-Self. Other writers also recognise that the obstacles in the way of socialism are “ psychological ” ; (Gettel, *Political Science*, p. 387 ; Bertrand Russell, *Roads to Freedom*.) The only solution of these psychological, ethical, metaphysical difficulties is rational, scientific, Essential Religion, *including* a scientific scheme of Socio-Individual life.

actively struggle, *against* capitalist-imperialist-militarist-craft, financier-craft, bureau-craft, ruler-craft, which works now with deep hypocrisy, again with brutal audacity, always with ruthless oppression and exploitation; and we have to educate and struggle *for* honest, genuine, rational trade and regulated private initiative and enterprise side by side with great socialised public works and services, mines and factories, worked, not so much directly by State servants (whence all the well-known evils of Bureaucracy) as through Trusts, Associations, Companies, Guilds, (Skt., *shrēṇis*, *pūgas*, *sārṭhas*), with profits or remunerations carefully limited, regulated, controlled by the State.

Dr. Annie Besant seems to have forecast some such solution in some of her lectures, saying, with special reference to the huge U. S. A. 'trusts' and 'combines' and 'big business' of private shareholders, that after they had reached their climax in the personal interests of these private owners, the State would have to take them over in the general interests of the public, or "the whole business and its accumulated capital" would be "handed over . . . to be worked by the employees".¹

The Ancient Socialism and the Modern

It has been indicated elsewhere that the ancient Indian Scheme of Social Organisation endeavours

¹ *The New Civilisation*, Lecture iv. (Pub. 1928).

to effect just the desiderated compromise between unlimited competition and enforced co-operation, egoism and altruism, individualism and socialism, all-liberty and no-liberty, only private enterprise and only state-management, too little government and too much government, King Log and King Stork.¹ It does this by means of the definition and the partition of the rights and duties of each individual as an Individual, in the successive stages of life (Ashrama-dharma), and as an adult Member of Society, a 'Social,' during the stage of the Family-life as Householder (Varṇa-dharma). These rights and duties, work and enjoyment (of appropriate rewards), are so partitioned that genuine *equitability* is achieved, (or even *equality*, *sama-tā*, but more in a *psychological* and *spiritual* sense than in the *economic* sense of the Communist).

When such equitability or equality as between individuals, and such balance of power as between the several vocational classes, is achieved *within* every society, every nation, every people, then the causes which produce capitalism and imperialism and militarism and armament-races, competitions for markets and raw materials and wars (*viz.*, misappropriation of science, and ever-increasing recurrent private profits, and the need to invest and re-invest them abroad over and over again, and

¹ See Bhagavan Das, *The Science of Social Organisation ; Ancient Solutions of Modern Problems ; The Cruz in Politics or Who should be Legislators.*

the wish to get the investment protected and guaranteed by political and military power), disappear, and though there may yet be wars, for other reasons, chiefly human nature's inherent pugnacity, they would be among the men of the fighting temperament only, and would not involve civilian populations wholesale, as the last war did. Without such balanced equality or equitability within each people, Disarmament Conferences, arranged by the so-called Great Powers, which try to prevent *effects*, while not touching, while even indirectly promoting, the *causes* of war, are bound to fail; are indeed, nothing else than 'cunning' and at the same time most 'foolish' efforts to throw dust into others' as well as their own eyes, by the participating Powers.¹

The Radical Fallacy of Current Economics

The belief that money should yield not only interest but excessive interest and also compound interest and for an infinitely long time, that investment of capital should not only yield profit but excessive profit and should breed more and more capital through savings of ever-increasing profits and newer and newer investments and re-investments without end—this is the radical fallacy,

¹ For details regarding this and another more immediate cause of the failure of the Disarmament Conferences, see Bhagavan Das, *Annie Besant and the Changing World*.

transferred to current economic theory and practice, of not only perpetual motion but perpetual motion multiplying itself and increasing unlimitedly and infinitely in geometrical progression, out of a very small and very limited beginning.

Nature makes infinite multiplication of any finite person or thing impossible, by inevitable conflict with the multiplication of other entities. Wise social systems achieve the same result peacefully, in financial matters, by limiting the rates of interest, disallowing compound interest, making such laws as that the total amount repayable, as principal and interest, shall not exceed twice (or other fixed multiple of) the principal, (*dām-dopat*) and so forth; (*Manu*, viii, 151-153). British law, it seems, makes illegal, all arrangements for the nursing of deposits, in banks or with trustees, at compound interest, for very long or indefinite periods.

Another source of vast mischief and confusion is the fact that *money*, *i.e.*, coin, originally intended as a *token* for goods, to *facilitate barter* or exchange, has itself become an object of a special trade, *i.e.*, banking; and this trade has been grossly corrupted by the fact that a *token for the token* has been created in the shape of *paper-currency*, and this paper-money is now in no country backed to the extent of its full face-value by corresponding reserve of coin or bullion, and is at times and in places unbacked by such 'firm cover' to the extent of 75 p.c. or even more—which plainly means swindling

by the Governments or the Banks which issue the paper-notes; clearly it is "trading on *false credit*," false because unbacked by coin or goods, "trading on *hollow reputation*," hollow because not supported and justified by real possession; it is all acting on false pretences, for a person who possesses only twenty-five coins to tell the public that, and to behave as if, he has a hundred. This behaviour gives rise to all kinds of artificially created complications, "inflations, deflations, hoardings, releasings, etc., by which the cunningest and luckiest few financiers and the Governments (*i.e.*, the Bureaucrats) profit, temporarily, and the vast lay public of the middle and the poorer classes suffers grievously. But Nemesis never falls asleep wholly; Nature's cyclic laws grind round and round slowly but surely, in every department of the World-process; all persons cannot be befooled for all time; sins come home to roost; antagonisms and wars, economic and martial, individual and national, arise, and great destructions of life and property, and immense financial failures and insolvencies, individual and national, and enormous world-wide economic distress, are the consequence.

The old Samskr̥t word for weal-th, (weal, wellness, welfare) property, money, is *dhanam*. Etymologically, in the Veda, it means "that which fruits, produces fruit, *ḍadhanti*, *phalaṭi*," things and beings which have the biological property of self-multiplication, grains, fruits, also cattle;

whence a saying in a *Smṛti* (law-book), *uttamam go-dhanam dhanam*, "the finest wealth is cattle". Machinery and urban amenities are all very well and make life *interesting*; but agriculture and farm products and rural industries make life *possible*. In later Samskr̥t, *dhanam* came to mean "that which tinkles, *dhanati*, *svanati*, sounds," coin; and *dhānyam*, a derivative of *dhanam*, etymologically, and the source of 'coins' (by sale) economically, came to be used for food-grains generally and rice-grain specially; the word is also connected with *dhānam*, *poshaṇam*, nourishment, hence "that which nourishes"; also, *dhānāh*, which in the plural, means seeds, buds. The ancient Indian form of 'thanks'-giving is *dhanyah asi*, "you are blessed, may you be blessed, you are worthy to be blessed, with more *dhanam*, (since you make such helpful use of it)". Incidentally, it is quite possible that the English word 'thanks,' of as yet untraced origin, is connected with *dhanyah*, as also the similarly untraced word 'barter' with the Samskr̥t word *wār̥ta*, "trade, commerce," from *vṛtti*, "means or way of living, livelihood".

A quotation from a very modern writer will illustrate the right and the wrong meanings of *dhanam* and 'money'. In an address given to the American Academy of Political Science, and printed in *The Political Quarterly* (1933), on "The Stark Economic Fallacy," and re-delivered in England, and

published as *The Political Madhouse*, G. B. Shaw says: "The prosperity of a country is always measured at present by the money it receives for its exports. A 'favorable balance of trade' is what the financiers clamour for ; and by it they mean an excess of exports over imports. This seems reasonable enough to people who think in terms of *money*. To people who think in terms of *goods*, it is *raving nonsense*. Foreign trade is nothing but *barter* conducted with *money* ; and to maintain that in barter the more you give and the less you get in exchange the more prosperous you are, is to qualify yourself for the *asylum*. Yet in America and England it qualifies you for the Cabinet. A financier cannot think in terms of *bread and butter* or bricks and mortar ; he thinks in *figures* : sending *goods* out of the country means to him nothing but attracting *money* into it. His ideal is a country which exports everything it produces, and gets nothing in return but title-deeds to gold . . . This craze for getting money into the country makes the financier very keen on foreign investments . . . The first effect of the foreign loan is to stimulate exports. But the ultimate effect is to annihilate exports by producing a state of things in which the nation lives on an income which comes from abroad as interest on the foreign loan and exports nothing in return. The financier is caught in his own trap, and you " (the public of his country) "are caught with him. He wants

more exports, more exports, and still more exports. To stimulate them he organises foreign investments which mean more imports, more imports, and still more imports. He is working at the same time for a policy of producing and exporting everything, and for a policy of importing everything and producing nothing. The result of these two contrary impulses struggling in his brain is, that you revere him as an absolute master of finance when he has reduced himself to nothing but a neurotic gambler with a very bad complex. If it were not that his left hand is continually undoing the work of his right, he would have ruined you long ago . . .” Referring to the ignominious failure and futility of the World Economic Conference of 1933, held in London, and “the delusions which constituted the mental equipments of the delegates,” he says: “The Conference was bound, in the face of nature, to assume that the world must live from hand to mouth on *the year’s harvest*, and can by no slight of financial or other magic obtain a single grain of wheat from any future year’s crop nor a slice from any future year’s land. But the delegates all accepted as a familiar and unquestionable fact that the next twenty years’ harvests are at the immediate disposal of every one who can pay for them in paper-money. The Conference depended on an unshakable conviction that all *real trade is a barter of goods and necessary services, and that where there is*

no exchange there is robbery . . . The Russian delegate was the only one who proceeded on mentionable assumptions, and he confessed that his reason was giving way under the strain of having to argue with a conference of incurable lunatics. He was saved by his sense of humor; but his sense of humor could not save the world situation. The lunatics have gone home to their respective national asylums but they are still in charge there; and if our affairs are not taken out of their hands we shall go to smash."

Capitalism and World-Confusion

The following will further illustrate the subject: "Our education has usually completely failed to leave any awareness of what on the one hand human nature is like, and on the other any perception of the principles, which must be applied if any society is to work at all, of *how man can be fitted to society and society to man.*"¹ "The main hope of peace lies in the organisation of the economic systems of the Great Powers. The answer to imperialism is social reform . . . The problem of the pacifist is to secure such a redistribution of income as will prevent the flow of capital into sources which require the State-power for its protection . . . The redistribution

¹ This is precisely what Manu's Educational Organisation, as the most important part of his total Scheme of Social Organisation, endeavours to do.

of income looks definitely towards a more equal society.¹ . . . Trade-unionism and Socialism, as they work for that more equal Society, are definitely serving the cause of peace. For the more their success renders impossible the achievement of those surplus incomes which are the basis of the imperial adventure, the more the pressure for foreign markets, of that kind in which economic imperialism has specialised, becomes mitigated. . . . The more profound the imperialist interests of a people the less secure its democracy. . . . The stronger the continuity of colonial or foreign policy and the pursuit of *common imperialist* aims [by different political parties in a country like Britain for instance] "the smaller the public criticism; with the result that *parliamentary control becomes a polite fiction*."²

"We must remember, further, the growing degeneration of the classical democratic institutions. 'In proportion as the mass of citizens who possess political rights increases,' writes Lafargue, 'and the number of elected rulers increases, the *actual*

¹ Manu secures such better distribution and redistribution by restricting profits in business and interest on loans, disallowing simultaneous pursuit of many means of making money or earning livelihood by the same persons, and insisting on performance of 'sacrificial,' 'pious,' 'or public' works by all the well-to-do; (chs. viii, x). All religions and all the old civilisations have condemned usury. The new Western civilisation encourages it in its worst form, profiteering.

² *The Way to Prevent War*, edited by Leonard Woolf, (pub. 1933) by seven specialists, among them Sir Normal Angell and Prof. H. Laski, from whose essays the extracts are taken, pp. 492, 502-536.

power is concentrated and becomes the *monopoly* of a smaller and *smaller group* of individuals.' 'Such,' comments Trotsky, 'is the secret of the majority.' Everywhere, it is evident, legislatures have declined in either authority or prestige. Either, like the *English Parliament*, they become the *creature of the executive*, or like the legislatures of France and America, their conflict with the executive prevents them from making an effective policy. The boss in *America*, the *caucus* in *England*, these simply organise masses of voters to carry out the choice upon which they have determined. An American President is not made by the people; they merely select one of two men whom a handful of organisers in either party has decided upon as a satisfactory figurehead. *The voter cannot be influential in electorates of the modern size; the deputy is little better off.* Power in the modern democratic state passes to a small number of efficient *wire-pullers* who understand how to control the machine. And every *legislature* is so *overwhelmed by business* that it has no time to discuss adequately any *important question*. What, in short, is *interesting* in representative Government is not its anatomy, but its *pathology*."¹ To this, we may add that in India, the farcical nominal legislature is much more patently and expressly under the thumb of the executive, and is also kept 'diverted' from really important questions by overwhelming

¹ Laski, *Communism*, pp. 135-6.

'business' of the paltriest sort specially provided for its pas-time and for the exhaustion in safe ways of its capacity for loquacity. The only remedy, here, is indirect election, of the really best and wisest persons, representative of the main functions of society, *i.e.*, the principal vocations or occupations.¹ " . . . A resurrection of the royal prerogative and government through Orders in Council have knocked big holes into our quondam political system; . . . it is patent that the centre of gravity of our public life is shifting away from the House of Commons to the . . . anonymous financiers or equally anonymous Treasury Officials . . . "

"If democracy means the end of imperialism, it is natural for the imperialist to contemplate the end of democracy. By owning the instruments of production within itself, a Socialist State has already taken a large step towards realising the prospect of a permanent peace.³ It has then rid itself of a class of *wealthy citizens* who, being unable to spend what they receive in income . . . and driven to *invest abroad* ever larger profits . . . are the *main source of imperialistic fever*. . . . The

¹ See *Outline Scheme of Swaraj for India*, by C. R. Das and the present writer, and *The Crux in Politics or Who should become Legislators*.

² *Twelve Studies in Russia*, p. 125.

³ In Manu's scheme, the land, the main 'instrument' or 'means of production,' the earth as 'the supporter of all,' 'the supplier of all the wants of men,' belongs to the State, with certain limited rights to cultivators, farmers, pastors, and other workers.

attainment of peace involves an equal society as its primary condition . . . If war is the real evil, the way to deal with war is not to deal with the occasions out of which it comes, but the deeper causes of which these occasions are merely the expressions . . . An international world, if it desires peace, cannot be built upon a system of separate sovereign states, the reality of whose sovereignty is simply a function of the power of which they dispose . . . A world-community of Socialist States, by reason of their natural inclination to *concentrate upon domestic well-being*, is more likely to pursue a *peaceful policy* than any other form of social organisation.¹ For every emphasis upon equality denies the affirmation that the characteristics of imperial expansion are valid; and these are the root-causes of war . . . Only in an equal world-community of which the *economic life is deliberately planned as a whole*, is there any serious chance of a lasting peace."²

The Communist view of the necessity for 'World-Revolution' before Communism can become really safe, is this same view put in other and more

¹ The main function of the State—whatever its political form, monarchical, oligarchical, republican—is laid down by Manu and all succeeding law-givers as being "the maintenance of the Social Organization," by seeing that everyone does the duty assigned to him by that Organisation, in other words "concentrating upon domestic well-being". All the constituent and ministrant or preventive and promotive functions of the State are but sub-divisions of this.

² *The Way to Prevent War*, Op. cit.

formidable words.¹ The ancient Indian way of putting it is that there should be one all-inclusive world-wide Organisation of the whole of the Human Race into the four Vocational Classes, though there may be many separate States.

¹ "At present no movement on earth seems so devoid of hope as world-revolution": M. Hindus, *The Great Offensive*, p. 273. The last chapter of the book explains cogently why this is so; briefly, because of the existence of a strong middle class, in other countries, which resists being swallowed up, on the one hand, by the super-capitalists, and, on the other, by the proletariat; the success of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia was due to the absence of such a middle class combined with the very special and unusual circumstance of general disintegration of State-authority in consequence of crushing defeat in the World-War and the scattering of millions of disgusted peasant-soldiers with arms in their hands, all over Russia, and willing to be utilised by Communist leaders ready and able to seize the opportunity. It also dwells upon the alternatives to Communism (as do the last chapters of Laski's *Communism* and Cole's *Through the World-chaos and Europe To-day*.) Hindus says: "If Communist ideas gain dominance in the world, it will be through some method other than the class struggle and the proletarian dictatorship. It is not inconceivable that Fascist or some other middle-class dictatorships will, of their own accord, make Communist ideas their own. Already the Communist idea of planned production is agitating their minds, and not only theirs but those of the whole capitalist world. If they, and other rulers, cannot introduce planned production in a competitive society, they will curb competition just as capitalist governments are beginning to curb the rights and privileges of individual enterprise"; p. 285. But it seems that planned production *can* be introduced to a considerable extent in even a competitive society, if the system of private but state-advised Trusts is utilised. The system of super-taxes is not a check upon but rather an additional stimulus to the swindling and cunning super-capitalist with far-flung business; it means to him only that he should plunder more and give a bigger share to his government for aiding and abetting his robberies; because of his world-wide transactions he can perhaps fake his accounts and evade tax better also.

It may also be noted that the conditions in India are very like those of Russia, a vast and very unhappy agricultural

It is well-known that the new Russia suffers from endemic terror of attack by Capitalist States, and is very greatly hampered in its internal progress by the overpowering need to be prepared against external danger; and, on the other side, Capitalist States suffer from a corresponding terror of insidious Communist propaganda and consequent internal revolutions, and have to go on wasting resources and supplies, which are cruelly needed for the support of honest civilians, on the maintenance of vast numbers of Misemployed in the shape of fighting forces, to keep their own "subjects" down, and to disable and destroy Socialist States, as well as hamstringing their fellow Capitalist-States, as soon as there is an opportunity. "Two of a trade can never agree"; and "thieves must fall out some day". If only the nations could say to each other across the trenches: "Brothers, why should we fight? You go home and attend to your families; and we go home and attend to ours,"—all of them would become happy. But Māyā deprives them of sanity and common sense, blinds them to their own best and most permanent interests, and drives them from love to hatred, from all-blessing altruism to all-cursing egoism.

population, a very small and weak middle-class, practically nothing between the peasants-proletarians and revolution except the paid bureaucracy, and the perpetual danger of war with other capitalist-imperialist states. The path of wisdom and happiness for all concerned is the path of re-constitution of the whole Society and the whole State on the principles of the Golden Mean of the Varn-Āshrama State.

Its *āvaraṇa-shakti*, the power to 'veil' the eyes from the Truth of Universal Brotherhood, and its *vikshēpa-shakti*, the power to 'drive' man into the wrong direction of Universal hateful selfish Strife, are working all around us patently.

Reconciliation of Differing 'Isms'

Whether the principles of Manu help better towards the establishment of "an equal world-community" and the balancing and due satisfying of all the permanent and indefeasible requirements of human nature, or the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, etc., or of Mussolini, Hitler, etc., or of Mustafa Kemal, or of Roosevelt, or any others that may be in operation at present on this earth—this, it is suggested here, should be systematically examined by theosophical research-groups.

It is submitted, at the same time, for due consideration, that a certain amount of 'individualism,' of 'personality,' of 'private personal life,' (with its three primal incidents, attributes, constituent factors, the instincts for Spiritual as well as Physical Food, for Private Homestead and Property, for Spouse and Family life), is necessary to make life worth living, during its Pursuant first half—always, of course, in subordination to Humanism.

Manu's principles provide for such minima (in some respects, and even maxima in some others) of

individualism and familism, and also for corresponding minima of 'local patriotisms' and 'group-feelings' of various kinds, (though not 'nationalism,' 'communalism,' 'sectarianism,' 'denominationalism,' etc., in the modern sense), all within the circle of a maximum of 'Scientific' Socialism, by laying out a Scheme of universal Social Organisation as well as what may be called 'Individual' Organisation (*i.e.*, the planning out of each individual life into stages, each with its rights and duties), and at the same time recognising separate administrative territorial-linguistic-racial units or States.

If all the nations *organised for internal peace* and domestic well-being, they would be automatically, implicitly, and successfully *organising against external war*, simultaneously, by cutting at the root of those economic motives, referred to before, which are causing the modern wars. One positive "Do this" necessarily includes all the "Don'ts" against all the possible activities which hinder the "Do"; but no amount of "Don'ts" implies a single positive "Do". What to say of organising expressly *for war*, even to organise *against war*, and to do so even sincerely and not merely by diplomatic professions, but *without* organising *for internal peace*, is merely to illustrate the self-deceiving fallacy of "masterly inactivity" or "deterrent preparedness," as it was described by such politicians of the old School as the late Lord Salisbury,

when Prime Minister of Britain. It only leads to such mutual butcheries and economic ruin as the last War and its sequelæ—the war which has been unctuously called “the war to end war”. The great cats first swell, in “masterly inactivity,” but shortly begin to strut, then arch their backs, and growl and snarl and spit, and then inevitably and suddenly clinch. Progress in civilisation has meant cessation of ‘nomadic’ plundering of one another, and ‘settling’ down to agricultural and rural, then industrial and urban, life. The feature of war is the element of nomadism still persisting. International co-operative planning is the next advance in ‘settled’ civilisation, but it must be founded on co-operative planning *within* each nation, by arranging not only the Social life in four Varṇas, vocational classes, but also the Individual life in four Āśhramas, stages, (of student, householder, honorary public worker, and spiritual anchorite).

The economic hardships, the financial difficulties, of the nations to-day are exactly the same, on a vast scale, as those which beset, on a small scale, any ‘over-crowded’ trade or profession in a single street or a single town. If there is one shopkeeper, one vendor of any particular kind of much-wanted goods, one lawyer, one doctor, one tailor, he prospers exceedingly, gets his own price, cannot meet the demand. If, bye and bye, dozens set up the same business, in the same street or the same

town, and all compete for the same body of customers, none can get enough custom and all begin to starve. Britain, first in the field of the capitalism-industrialism-mercantilism of the present Machine-Age became immensely rich. But now all the stronger nations are competing and making 'the flag' follow 'the trade'. The resulting imperialist and militarist fever has already caused the *delirium tremens* of the World-War.¹ Not taking the right remedy, continuing to indulge in the old intemperate habits and vicious predatoriness, regrowing and sharpening their claws and fangs and teeth and beaks and talons, but also seriously afraid to clinch again after the lessons of their last experience, they are now carrying on a trade and tariff war, side by side with outbursts of diplomatic bluff and counter-bluff. The only result is that all are suffering more or less from inability to sell the goods they manufacture. This world-wide 'slump,' which seems to be due to 'dumps,' and haphazard, unplanned, frantically competitive over-production, particularly of the wrong sort and quality of articles, is really so in the limited view; but in the wider view, it is caused (1) by *lack of proper distribution* of goods as well as population, of work as well as wages-and-profits, of labor as well as capital, (2) by *disproportion*, in given times and places, between the numbers of the vendors and the customers.

¹ See Moon, *Imperialism and World-Politics* (ed. of 1928).

the producers and the consumers, those who supply and those who demand, and (3) by *misfits* of aptitude and occupation, worker and work.

The Radical Cure for the Radical Defects

These radical defects are not likely to be cured permanently by such trick-devices, jugglings with currency, artificial inflations and deflations, goings on and off gold or silver or other standards, declarations of partial or complete insolvency disguised in euphemistic and imposing language, postponements or repudiations of debts, etc., as are being resorted to by the leading countries to-day. Such devices may be able perhaps to postpone the evil day for any particular country; but they are not likely to stave it off finally even for that country, and will surely cause all sorts of wide-spread miseries to masses of human beings elsewhere.

The radical defects can be radically and universally cured only by *better distribution of goods as well as population, etc., due proportion between vendors and customers, etc., and proper fitting of each individual member of society into appropriate occupation, as indicated above. This is possible only by Planning of the Social and the Individual life interdependently.*

A very great gap in Communist theory and practical planning is the absence of all attempt to plan out the Individual life systematically.

Only by planning both Social and Individual life will be realised that "... best and surest of all sanctions against war [which] lies in making the ties of peace too strong to break . . . The League's" [i.e., the League of Nations'] "adjunct, the International Labor Organisation, is based on recognition that *international peace* and *social peace* are bound up together, and that conditions of labor exist involving such injustice, hardship, and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are impaired".¹

As *international peace* is to *social peace* and *vice versa*, so is *social peace* to *family and individual peace*, and *vice versa*. Each family and each individual must be at peace within and with itself and himself and herself, through Āshrama-dharma, before social peace within any nation can be established; and each nation must be at peace within itself through Varna-dharma, before international peace can be achieved.

World-conditions to-day, binding all countries together, willingly or unwillingly, in the bonds of scientific discoveries and inventions, of the daily press, of trade and commerce, of travel, of good and bad political relations, make possible the taking of the next great step in the March of Humanity towards Perfection (which is duly defined by the Universal Religion), and the realisation of

¹ *The Way to Prevent War*, op, cit., pp. 294, 313.

good in itself. To do so would make intelligible language impossible. Every Evil could be called Good, and every Good, Evil, in an endless merry-go-round, and the distinction between them, indispensable for intelligent and intelligible life and conversation, would disappear. Because death is inevitable, some day, therefore should everyone commit suicide now, at once? It is true that, in the *Purāṇas*, the Ṛṣhi Nārāḍa, a personified principle or law of Nature, promotes war deliberately; but he does so between arrogant, vicious, greedy kings or militarists, for their mutual destruction and the benefit of the simple honest peaceful people. This is very different from a philosophical worship of war. But of course it may be rightly said that such worship is the appropriate perverse philosophy of the militarist who is doomed to come under the influence of Nārāḍa. It is also true that War is of divine origin. But this is so only in the metaphysical sense in which every thing and all things, both the factors of every pair of opposites, angels and devils, loves and hates, pleasures and pains, life and death, originate in the Divine Spirit (which ideates and includes Matter) of Universal Life. Dirt, poisonous insects, carnivora, disease-microbes, epidemics too are undoubtedly of divine origin ultimately. But, therefore, it does not follow that human habitations should be deliberately filled with them. *Our* duty is to range ourselves on the side of the good, of

love, of peace, to try our utmost to sweep all evil things away, to prevent war all we can even though we may know it to be a task impossible of complete fulfilment. If they must come, they may do so against our consent, against our will; not with them. If we ever *have* to war against fellow-men, as we may have to when aggression and oppression become wholly relentless, there we must make sure, as Manu repeatedly enjoins, that our spirit and our purpose are purely *defensive*. Such *defence*, all systems of law permit.

The Maltreatment of the Three Instincts
by Capitalism

Be it noted carefully, in passing, that while as has been said above, on the strength of the observations of others, Communist Russia has set its face against the Religious, Property, and Family instincts, the maltreatment of these, in different ways, by the hypocrisy of the Capitalist States, is far worse than that by the brutal frankness of the Communist State. Some persons speak of "barrack-room Socialism" in decrimal of the results of Communist efforts. They have to be reminded that such "barrack-room Socialism" is any day and every way far better than the "dole-house pauperism" and the "industrial slummism" created by Capitalism.

These Capitalist States—glaringly so in the case of a State like the British Empire, with a *Dependency* like India—*profess* outwardly to be *Defenders* of 'Faith' and Family and Property; in practice, by their evil laws and worse administration of those laws, they are Promoters of Priestcraft, the very Antithesis of Religion, and of communal dissensions, and Lack of Food for the masses, and the Deprivation of Property of the vast majority by a comparative handful, and the Ruin of Family-life by widespread Pauperism on the one hand, Prostitution and Sex-slave Traffic on the other, secret Promiscuity and general Adultery on the third, and Drugs and Drink Traffic and Dicing and Gambling Business all round; and they destroy the personality of the masses and reduce them to the condition of serfs and slaves, far worse than the Communist State does. Incidentally, it is reported that there are many more cases of Divorce now in super-capitalist U. S. America, and, it would seem, among the wealthier classes in Britain and other western countries also, than in Russia. A class of women, called 'alimony-sharks,' is said to be growing in the U. S. A.—women who inveigle rich men into marriage and then divorce them on various pretences, securing substantial alimony from them through the lawyers and law-courts, in order to indulge their senses freely afterwards.

*The Family-Home as Moral Laboratory and
Archetype of Socialist State*

If the Second Object of the T. S. is pursued rightly, the T. S. should be able to convince the thoughtful, and through them the thoughtless, (who are now being driven, by the cruel mismanagement of all human affairs in these Capitalist States, into Communistic crusades against Home and Family as well as against Religion and Property), that the three instincts are innate, and that their due, and not more than due, satisfaction is necessary, and has been and is recognised as such in all the great religions. In Manu's Scheme, indeed, the just satisfaction of the three instincts, through Dharma (Religion, human and divine Law, Right-and-Duty), Artha (lawfully acquired Property, Weal-th), and Kāma (righteous Family-life and sense-Enjoyment), is expressly enjoined as the end and aim, Purush-ārtha, of the first or Pursuant or worldly Half of the individual life; while the Higher Religion of Moksha, (Emancipation, Freedom from mundane bonds) and honorary public work, and Asceticism are prescribed for the second or Renunciant Half. ¹

¹ *Manu-Smṛiti*, ii, 224; vi, 35-36.

In Persian-Arabic terms, the ends of the Pursuant Half of human life may be called *Mazhab*, and *Māl*, and *Masarraṭ-i-khānā-dārī*, or *Dayānaṭ*, and *Ḍaulaṭ*, and *Lazzaṭ-uḍ-Ḍunyā*; while the end of the second and Renunciant Half of it may be

Especially is the institution of the Family indispensable, not only for the satisfaction of the sex-instinct, but also for the soul's higher education, by the *sublimation* of the carnal desires and sensuous *passions* into psychical affections and Spiritual *com-passions*. Herbert Spencer was able to observe that there was an antagonism between the nutritive and the reproductive instincts; but, pre-judiced against psychical super-physics and Spiritual meta-physics, content with the mere enunciation of an Unknowable, he naturally failed to observe that while the *physical* aspect of the reproductive instinct is connected with and almost the consequence of the full satisfaction of the nutritive instinct, the antagonism between the two is created by the influx of a new and *super-physical* element, the advent of a new *living being*, the child, which insistentlly, compellingly, by the laws of *meta-physical* all-including Spirit, transforms the other-excluding selfish lusts of the parents into the other-including unselfish tenderness for the offspring, converts their individualistic 'separate'-passions into socialistic 'com'-passion for the baby. Every true Home is a moral laboratory, and every child is a potent apparatus for transmuting the

called *Najāt*, or *Lazzaṭ-ul-Ilāhiya*, or *Fanā-f-illāh*. The three primal appetites, in Samskr̥ṭ *Loka-ishānā*, *Vitta-ishānā*, *Dārasuṭa-ishānā* or *Putra-ishānā*, would in Persian-Arabic be the *hirs* for *Zamīn*, *Zar*, and *Zan*. *Zamīn* would include the fields of earth, the source of physical food, and also 'the plains of heaven,' attainable through *Mazhab*, the source of spiritual food."

base metal of the self-seeking animal man and animal woman into self-sacrificing *father* and *mother*, *collaborating* in the spirit of the best and highest socialism for the benefit of the younger generation and therefore of the whole of Society. "Men were created to be *fathers*, women were created to be *mothers*"¹ i.e., to realise the high Spiritual meaning of Fatherhood and Motherhood, to feel the 'divine' heart-aches and heart-joys of paternity and maternity over the child.) What Manu says in stately solemn words, a Russian peasant, distracted over a very sick child, cried out in the poignant and profoundly significant language of an agonised heart, "Without a child, without even one child, you blunder about like a lost soul".² Woman is not to be honored as woman and wife, man is not to be honored as man and husband, but as mother and as father. Love thy wife and thy husband, with all thy heart, by all means; but "*honor, revere, thy father and thy mother,*" say Moses and Christ; "*bil wāliḍaini ehsāna,*" says Muhammad; "*pitṛ-dēvo bhava, maṭṛ-dēvo bhava,*" say the Vedas. God the World-Father, Nature the World-Mother, Man the child of God's Nature—these constitute the Family-Home of the Universe in the terms nearest and dearest to the heart of man. "Husband, wife, child—these three together make up the complete human

¹ *Manu-Smṛiti*, ix, 96.

² M. Hindus, *Humanity Uprooted*, p. 109 (edn. of 1932)

being”;¹ an individual, as such, is an incomplete personality, with unfulfilled destiny, and cannot be regarded as the unit of Society. The Family is the unit of Society. The Family-Home is the first and the best School of true Socialism. Without the heart-experience which the Family provides, it is not possible to realise why and how one can and should sacrifice his own ease, health, even life itself, if and as necessary, for any one else. The Joint Family patently embodies and acts upon the essential principles of Socialism, “To all according to their needs, from all according to their capacities,” “Each for all, all for each”. To abolish or weaken the Family is to abolish and weaken human Society and Socialism. It is the Spiritual affections of the Family which are the type and source of those wider sympathies and co-operations of Society that, in combination with self-conscious intelligence, distinguish the human and humane stage from the animal.

Socialist Insect Communities

Some persons, now and then, hold up the example of the Social insects, ants, bees, termites,

¹ *Manu-Smṛiti*, ix, 45. Cf. Wordsworth :

“ . . . A child, more than all other gifts
That earth can offer to declining man,
Brings hope with it and forward-looking thoughts ”

And the *Mahā-bhārata* :

पुत्रः स्पर्शवत्तं वरः ।

“ There is no touch so sweet as that of the child.”

as worthy of imitation by men. Theosophy, as outlined in H. P. B.'s *The Secret Doctrine*, has its own peculiar views about these wonderful animals, which the ordinary terrene scientist would jib at vehemently. But, any way, there are such unquestionable facts—which make the example impossible to copy—as that the queen termite is, in size, to the worker termite, as an elephant or even a whale is to an ordinary man; that, in most of the 'social' varieties, there is only one propagating pair in the whole termitarium, or hive, while the myriads of the population are sterile; that some have 'castes' far more rigid than the Hindus; and so on. Some writers have even "compared an insect Society to a super-organism . . . (so that) the castes exhibit a differentiation of *structure* and function corresponding with the division of labor among the organs of an animal body; a single individual is incapable of prolonged survival apart from other members of an insect community, almost as the separate organs of an animal body are incapable of independent existence; the *workers* and *soldiers* may be looked upon as the body of the super-organism, while the fertile members, representing the germ-cells, form the organism that ensures the continuance of the species".¹

¹ *Enc. Brit.*, 14th edn., art.: "Social Insects." Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, p. 106, states the pros and cons of insect and human societies respectively.

Manu's Organismic Society

Manu's Scheme, which expressly takes "the organismic view of Society," and subdivides it into four main vocational classes corresponding with the head, arms, trunk, and legs of the human organism, has already copied whatever is possible and desirable to copy from the social insects. Communism in Russia also seems to be unconsciously moving in the same direction, and will, let us hope, be compelled ere long, by the force of circumstances, to rectify the grave faults that at this time are vitiating it.

At present, Russia is developing into a super-Bureaucracy or State-Capitalism or State-Socialism (the terms are practically convertible) rather than Communism proper, and knows and admits it, justifying itself by saying that it is an unavoidable transitional stage. And much the same may be said of Italy, so far as Dictatorship and despotic rule by bureaucratic authority, and anti-parliamentarianism are concerned. In fact, in the last respect, Italy has gone beyond Russia, for as said above, the Italian Chamber of Deputies has been abolished from July, 1934.

Italy remains loyal to the Family, however; and Russia too, after a period of sexual orgy and crime, which drove "Lenin himself frantic with indignation,"¹ is settling down again to what is

¹ M. Hindus, *Humanity Uprooted*, p. 101, and *The Great Offensive*, p. 206. "In the early years of the Revolution . . . young and excited Revolutionaries, chiefly male intellectuals

very like conjugal domesticity, though with new legal forms, implications, and conditions which may perhaps by and by prove to be an improvement upon the old, or may not. It does not appear that Fascism is deliberately making any effort at *improvement* in respect of the institution of the Family, or of Religion; nor does it appear to be endeavouring to balance Public Enterprise and Private Enterprise on any carefully thought-out systematic plan, with regard to the institution of Property.

The Family Ideal vs. Marriage Degeneration

As in the case of Religion, so in that of the Family, we have to fight against the distortions and corruptions that have crept into and taken possession of the Marriage-institution and perverted it from a refining and ennobling sacrament into a frequent mismating and a sometimes intolerable bondage. But this means that we have to restore the pure, and not to destroy it together with the impure.

The Golden Mean

The golden mean, the middle course, must always remain the ideal to be striven for in everything. In economics, the condition of the "middle ... confused liberty with licentiousness and plunged into sexual orgies ... Then the Press and the Party and the Trade Unions launched a vehement campaign against sex laxity ... Lenin himself ... denounced laxity and promiscuity as bestial and detrimental to the individual and to Society. And then the orgies subsided." Op. cit., pp. 125-6.

class," the *bourgeoisie*, is desirable for all human beings—neither too rich, nor too poor. Instead of annihilating the *bourgeoisie*, by fair means or foul, Communism should endeavour (it has already levelled down or rather annihilated the *dvoryanin*, nobility, aristocracy), to level up the proletarians and particularly the *muzhiks*, all, into the *bourgeoisie*, so to say, so far as necessities and comforts and private belongings are concerned. And this is what its endeavours will result in ultimately, if they continue to be carried on honestly, uprightly, public-spiritedly, and no present or future Stalin puts a new Czarist or Napoleonic crown upon his head, and the Communist Party does not convert itself into a gross and crass Bureaucracy, subservient to and at the same time hampering him, and promoting its own interests at the expense of the public ruthlessly, as in Capitalist States, and especially in Dependencies.¹ The temptation, the intoxication, of power is overpowering. "Some

¹ Levine, *Stalin*, pp. 190-1 and 259-262, quotes Trotsky and Dmitrievsky (an ex-Bolshevik) on the evils of the Bureaucracy which has developed in the Bolshevik régime. The latter says, "Stalin is a victim of the strangling centralised bureaucracy which he himself has created. One recalls the horror with which Nicholas I exclaimed: 'Who said I was the ruler of the country? The country is governed by my bureaucrats!' So far Stalin is still the ruler; he sets the general course. But the basic force surrounding him consists of piratical adventurers, careerists who are waiting for Stalin to go, so that they may become the undivided masters of the land. Stalin restrains them . . . If Stalin's régime of economic and political terror is for the happiness of humanity, I do not want that happiness. I am suffocating in the atmosphere he has created." (p. 262.)

Communists became first-rate rascals, and some first-rate rascals became Communists.”¹ “The poison of power is notorious, and it is difficult to see why Communists should be held immune from its toxins. It is, indeed, so much the most powerful of the factors by which men in politics are moved that there is no theoretical reason why those who make the Communist revolution, or their successors, should abdicate from the pleasant task of exercising authority over their fellows.”² Morley speaks of the intense love of power of the Civil Servant in India.³ The insolent airs that persons in authority give themselves and the way they behave towards others are painfully notorious in most countries, far more so in “subject”-countries governed by other countries. The ‘public servant’ becomes the ‘public master’; he does not exist for the public, the public exists for him.

The Four Separate Functions and Powers in Society

The ancient Indian Scheme, recognising the complexity of the world-process and of human temperament, avoiding the blunder of believing uniformity to be unity, the futility of trying to fit everybody into the self-same bed of Procrustes, makes elastic provision for all due requirements

¹ M. Hindus, *The Great Offensive*, p. 206 (pub. 1933).

² H. Laski, *Communism*, 86 (edn. of 1932).

³ *Recollections*; M. Hindus, *Hum. Uprooted*, p. 181.

of different sorts of dispositions and temperaments, and at the same time maintains a balance between them, so that none might overwhelm any other. It distinguishes between the four main functions and the corresponding four main powers which uphold organised Human Society, Education and Science power, Protection and Arms (or Valour) power, Nutrition and Money (or Wealth, Commerce, Bread) power, and Assistance and Labor Power. These may be said to correspond to the three primal appetites mentioned before, and personified as Saraswatī-Shaktī, Durgā-Shaktī, Lakshmī-Anna-purnā-Shaktī, and what we may regard as primal plasmic undifferentiated Shaktī-Energy out of which all the other three, with numerous or indeed innumerable other "goddesses," evolve and differentiate and emerge, and into which they merge back again. For the preservation of Society, by means of a State-organisation, Manu entrusts these four great main functions and powers to four great main vocational-classes, distinguished by their temperaments and special aptitudes, the Educators, the Protectors, the Feeders, and the (general, unskilled, or little-skilled) Helpers, *separately*.¹ To gather two, three, or all four of these distinct functions and powers into any one pair of hands, to place any at the mercy and the will of any other, to disturb their *inter-dependence*,

¹ See Bhagavan Das, *Ancient Solutions of Modern Problems*, pp. 66-67.

their *mutual* dependence, is to disturb the balance of power indispensable for domestic well-being, is to court disaster. All the parts of the Social, as of the Individual, organism must be duly nourished and must be well-proportioned to each other. There must be no lop-sidedness, as there is sure to be if any one part is over-nourished, whether Proletarian (Brain-worker, or Manual worker), or *Muzhik*, or Communist.

One Middle Class—instead of two Extreme Classes, viz., the Too-Rich Few and the Too-Poor Many

In short, the middle course, and 'the middle class,' is the ideal. *Muzhiks* and Proletarians and Communists must all be 'levelled down' or 'levelled up' into it, so far as necessities and comforts are concerned. Of course, strict economic or any other equality is impossible, and a monotonous sameness is even undesirable. Evolution is differentiation. But the avoidance of extreme inequality is possible and very desirable. We see that in every country where there is a middle class, it has become subdivided into upper middle, middle middle, and lower middle. This is natural, and should not be hopelessly striven against. In Russia, judging by incomes and salaries, the Communists and Proletarians have become a 'middle class,' the new *bourgeoisie*, subdivided into three as above, and even among the *Muzhiks*, there is fierce resistance

to the levelling down of the thrifty and hardworking and intelligent to 'economic equality' with the thriftless, lazy, and witless, a resistance which even the omnipotent Dictator Stalin has so far proved impotent to overpower. "An ugly gulf of resentment is widening between town and country; the State prices based on forced levies, the peasant holding out for higher, to recoup for the forced sales, and satisfy natural acquisitiveness."¹

"The Communists discovered that the resistance of the peasants to a policy of socialisation is insurmountable . . . No amount of force will induce him . . . For his answer to force is the effective one of diminishing cultivation, and the townsman is compelled to surrender in order that he may get food. No social class has the same unending power to wait that the peasant possesses. His proximity to Nature breeds an endurance different in kind from every other class in society . . . Agriculture, indeed, despite the development of large-scale farming in western America, remains persistently individualist in temper."²

Collectivisation—yes, with sharing of produce in proportion to labor and other things contributed, as in a shareholders' association; but not socialisation—in the sense of equal division of the remainder, after the Entity called State has taken away what

¹ *Twelve Studies in Russia*, p. 118.

² Laski, *Communism*, pp. 110, 215-218 (edn. 1932).

it likes at its own sweet will, between the members of the collective, without ratio to their respective contributions; this is what the Russian peasant, the *muzhik*, seems to be successfully insisting on.

Four Main Guilds

It follows from the traditional Indian principles that there should be four main 'guilds' or 'trusts' or 'artels' or 'corporations' or 'organisations' or 'trade-unions' in each State; one, of the learned professions; another, of the executive professions; a third, of the wealth-making-and-managing professions; a fourth, of the laboring professions.¹ Provision is also made by those principles for co-ordinating the activities of all four and unifying the whole State under a supreme Legislature composed of elected functional representatives of all four, with special *ethical* and intellectual qualifications, and a supreme Executive head *subordinate* to the Legislature. This co-ordination is made in such a manner that the wisdom of the *first* shall principally make the laws and guide the defensive valour and the law-enforcing compulsive power of the *second*, so that the work of the *third* for supplying all the needs of all may prosper, and the *fourth* may be kept happy and enabled to help all.

¹ There are 22 Corporations in Fascist Italy, and 46 Trade-Unions in Communist Russia. All these could be grouped under the main four.

Persons are apt to imagine that the ideal of Indian traditions is "*brāhmaṇa rājya*," the rule of the *brāhmaṇa*. This is not the case by any means. On the contrary, the *brāhmaṇa*, *i.e.*, the man of the learned professions, is expressly *forbidden* to do the work of the *kshatṛiya*, *i.e.*, the man of the executive professions, to exercise compulsive force, or to wield arms (except in the way of the teacher, for the instruction of pupils in the science and art of war, or in the way of the defender, in dire emergency and when no man of the executive profession, policeman or soldier, is available, for the protection of the life or property of himself or others). His vocation, his means of livelihood, his way of living, his mission in life, is that of counsellor, guide, instructor, peace-maker, expert adviser, supervisor, legislator, not of compeller, punisher, executor, except in the last resort. No more must any member of any of the four main vocational classes encroach upon the functions and the corresponding means of living of any of the other three, except in "times of misfortune" and dire necessity, as specified in the 'law-books'. (*Manu*, chs. viii, x.)

In view of these facts, if the traditional Indian State has to be described in terms of *rājya*, then it is *Mānava-rājya*, which, in terms of 'cracy,' may be translated as an 'Aristo-homo-cracy,' 'the rule of the *best men*,' *i.e.*, legislation by the wisest and execution by the ablest. In terms of 'ism' it is Varṇ-āshram-ism and 'Human-ism'. In terms

of State, it is a 'Guild-State of Four Guilds,' each with a flexible and largely self-governed organisation of its own, which ensures expeditiousness in the despatch of work, elasticity, adaptability, and economy, and avoids the drawbacks and evils of rigid red-tapist officialism. Of course all the Guilds would have to be duly co-ordinated by a Central Legislature, composed of the best, the wisest, the most trusted and venerated representatives of the four Guilds, preferably all in the third Āshrama or stage of life, i.e., 'retired' from the competitive bread-winning second Āshrama or 'the household-stage' of life, no longer 'taking' but only 'giving,' and as far as possible attained to the status of 'holy men,' philanthropic, disinterestedly wishing well to all interests in just degree and proportion.

The difference between a State consisting of a System of Guilds, each self-governed, each self-organised (and not too rigidly but elastically organised) from within by voluntary co-operation stimulated by the need of '*alliance* for existence,' and benevolently guided and harmonised by a Central Body embodying the maturest experience and wisdom of all four, on the one hand; and a State other-governed, governed by a Bureaucracy, whether Capitalist, or Fascist, or Communist, and other-organised, organised from without by compulsion stimulated by the wish to '*struggle* for existence' or rather for infinite self-aggrandisement at the expense of others, on the other

hand ; the difference between these two is all the difference between a self-nourishing, self-repairing, self-renewing, self-propagating, living organism, on the one hand, and a dead machine requiring constant attention and perpetual artificial cleaning, oiling, repairing, renewing, replacing, and power-supplying by another, on the other hand. This fundamental distinction or rather difference is beginning to be recognised now by western writers on politics and sociology as that between a Co-operative Group and a police-organised Crowd.¹ It has been indicated in unsurpassable form, once for all, by the great Vedic metaphor of the Macro-cosmic Man, the Human Race with all its generations, past, present, and future, with the men and women of Knowledge as His Head, of Action as Arms, of Desire as Trunk, of unspecialised Mind as Legs.

Only when this mystic, yet wholly rational, wholly scientific, Idea of the Solidarity of Man pervades the Consciousness of Humanity as a whole, through incessant education of the right kind, only then will the ancient really and truly Scientific Socialism of the Four-Guild State receive its due and prove the salvation of Mankind. So long as the 'Attack-and-Defence' Idea, the 'Preparedness for War' Idea, the 'Struggle for existence' Idea,

¹ See Prof. J. S. Mackenzie, *Fundamental Problems of Life*, pp. 145-147, and the writers referred to there ; also, Bhagavan Das, *Ancient Solutions of Modern Problems*, pp. 66-67.

the 'Materialist Interpretation of History' Idea, toxicates and enthrals and maddens that Consciousness, the present militarist-bureaucratist mis-organisation of States will continue, whether the régime be brazenly Capitalist and Imperialist, or be disguised as Fascist, or masked as Communist, (with, of course, different degrees of exploitation of the masses, the Communist exploitation being the smallest), until the inevitable Armageddon, and the Kalki Avatāra, and then the re-establishment of Dharma, *i.e.*, the Varn-Āshrama Dharma.

An Objection and the Reply

With regard to the suggestion that the useful features of Russian Communism may be taken over and its mistakes and defects avoided, it may be objected that every virtue has its vice and every vice its virtue, and that if we are to take over the good features of Bolshevism we cannot avoid its bad ones also. Yet there appears no radical inconsistency between those good features, on the one hand, and the duly regulated exercise and satisfaction of all the three instincts, of Religion, Property, and Family, on the other. As has been attempted above to be proved by references to the reports of observers, Bolshevism itself has, in practice, been compelled, as a fact, to recognise and make permissive allowance if not positive provision for them.

If it can be established that the instincts are *not* fundamental to the human being as at present constituted, then we shall freely admit that all our argument is wrong. Till then we may hold on to our present views.

*The Individualist Peasant as Bulwark of
Private Property*

“The central mistake in Bolshevist policy was, it is probable, greatly to under-estimate the *psychic* resistance they would encounter . . . The peasant has become *de facto* owner of the soil. Herein Russian agrarian life shares all the characteristic features of the new peasant states of Eastern Europe; and there is no special reason to suppose that the Russian village will prove more amenable to Communist ideas than the peasantry of other lands. Private trading, moreover, has, though after a bitter struggle, been restored upon something approaching its pre-war scale; and the needs of production have led to the re-introduction of what would elsewhere be described as bourgeois small industry. The idea of equal wages has gone; piecework and the bonus upon output have been glorified . . . The *large industries* have been organised into *great trusts*, and they resemble, in their working and relation to the State, nothing so much as the railway companies of England and America. Small factories are leased either to their

former owners, or to other persons; and their organisation and conduct is not noticeably different from those of other countries. After a disastrous attempt to abolish a money-economy, the normal currency has been restored; and with it have come the usual habits of a State concerned to tax that its budget may be balanced.”¹ “The Russian Revolution emphasises now, not equality but inequality of income, which means inequality in standard of living.”² “A good deal of artisan work . . . is done . . . by Artels which are co-operative associations of producers; in the same way a collective farm is usually an Artel; and workers in Artels are recognised and encouraged by the State.”³ “The financial structure of the U. S. S. R. . . . has to-day many features in common with those of capitalist countries . . . But the superficial similarity of technique hides a very wide difference in essence . . . The *trusts* which run its industry *are organs of the State*.”⁴ The U. S. S. R., while wisely avoiding the contraction of debts to foreign capitalists, raises huge *internal* loans periodically (one of three and a half milliard roubles was reported by the papers for April, 1934); presumably the private citizens subscribe out of their *private savings*, and receive

¹ Laski, *Communism*, pp. 48-9.

² M. Hindus, *The Great Offensive*, p. 280.

³ *Twelve Studies in Russia*, p. 98.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 51-2 (by F. W. Pethick-Lawrence, Ex-member of the British Cabinet as Secretary of the Treasury).

interest from the State—which seems a very ‘capitalist’ process; and these securities, as well as shares in co-operative properties seem to be transferable and heritable¹—all which things are natural incidents of private property. “Moscow has had enough experience with the *muzhik* to realise that, when he thinks himself wronged, he strikes out with weapons which administrative weapons cannot counter . . . He sinks into apathy and lets things take care of themselves . . . The peasant joined the collective farm to obtain the advantages of large-scale farming, and if he does not obtain them he will feel badly and will seek improvement for himself elsewhere . . . The chief task of the newly formed *politotdely* or political committees on the tractor stations which supply machines to the collectives . . . is to encourage the peasant to bring out of the land, with the aid of science and the machine, all that it can yield, and this they can attain only through a sympathetic understanding of peasant complaints

¹ *Twelve Studies in Russia*, pp. 48, 102. A Moscow telegram dated 16-4-1934, describing the Soviet Government's efforts to increase its gold mining and production and stating the output in 1933 as worth ten and a half million pounds sterling, goes on to say that “the Central Executive Committee has announced the flotation of a domestic loan of 3,500 million paper roubles following the receipt of ‘requests’ from worker groups of various factories. The bonds will mature in 1944. Each year since 1927 there has been a loan of this kind, a so-called mass loan, so that now every fourth citizen holds at least one bond”. What does it mean? It looks very like the Savings Banks Deposits of capitalist countries, in a form slightly, not very, different:

and the satisfaction of peasant needs, above all through an assurance, not in words but in acts, of *suitable immediate rewards* for his labors . . . If collectivisation were to lean more on peasant co-operation and less on Government control, *particularly in the division of the crops*, the shortages in meat and dairy products would soon disappear . . . The army and the land have profited most from the advance of science and the machine . . . The machine and science, once they conquer a region, never abandon it, whether in city or village . . . *Given proper management and fit recognition to the human element on the collectives*, the movement can become the crowning achievement of the Soviets.”¹

*The Three Goddesses Worshipped in all Times
and Climes*

The three instincts of Religion (Science, Wisdom, Knowledge of the Immortal, of the Laws of God, of God's Nature, of Human Nature, of Man's Origin and Destiny), Family, and Property, have been worshipped by mankind in all times and all climes, ever since it came to possess its present

¹ M. Hindus, *The Great Offensive*, pp. 112-116. The more well-to-do *muzhiks* of Communist Russia are corn-producers, cattle-breeders, and private traders in their farm-produce, typical farmer-merchants; they are the *vaishyas* of Manu and the *Gītā* with their *kṛṣhī*, *go-rakṣā*, and *vāṇijya*. For Stalin's fears regarding the impending danger of the revival of the *kulaks*, large and rich farmers, see Levine, *Stalin*, p. 317.

psycho-physical constitution; as Saraswatī-Gaurī-Lakshmī (-Annapūrṇā) in India; as Alīm-Hayy-Mālik in Arabia; Athena-Aphrodite-Hera in Greece; Minerva-Venus-Juno in Rome. And so long as that constitution does not change radically, in a manner that is unforeseeable, mankind (if the metaphysic that underlies psychology, as it does all other sciences, is at all reliable), will continue to worship them in the future. Theosophy and the Theosophical Society should help in purifying and justifying that worship.

The three worst worries of human beings are connected with (1) their physical and spiritual health, their daily bread of the life physical and the life everlasting and the desire for assurance thereof, their feeling of illness and the craving for freedom therefrom, their sense of sin and imperfection and fear of perdition or annihilation and the yearning for certainty of salvation, (2) their means, resources, possessions, and the need for sufficiency and security thereof, and (3) their sex-life and the wish for reciprocation of affection and legitimacy of issue; briefly, they are health-worries, finance-worries, sex-worries. These can be set at rest only by the propitiation of the goddesses named above, through the due pursuit of the three ends of the first half of life, *viz.*, Dharma, Artha, and Kāma, or Virtue, Profit, and Pleasure, or Religion, Property, and Family.

Classlessness vs. Vocational Classes

When the Communist tries to abolish 'Classes' and make Society 'classless,' he means to abolish that form of society which divides all men into only two classes, rich and poor, capitalist and wage-earner, buyer of labor and seller of labor, money-owner and wage-slave.¹ If there were such a society, and wherever there is such a society, his endeavour would be and is perfectly righteous. But if class is to mean "occupational or vocational class," the *varṇa* of Manu, then the endeavour is not only erroneous but futile, as proved by the inevitable up-crop of the four main vocational classes in Bolshevik Russia, *viz.*, Peasants, Soldiers, Workers of two kinds, Manual and Intellectual, and by the unavoidable use of the word "class" in a description of "the Soviet-system . . . of governmental institutions," which "emerges from *class* organisations, and is based upon the conception of *class* unity rather than . . . individual votes . . . This [occupational] *class* system of voting and the method of indirect election . . . make . . . far easier . . . effective control over . . . the entire machine".²

On the view, propounded by many previous thinkers, French, German, English, and others, but latest and most elaborately by Marx, "the

¹ Laski, *Communism*, the whole of ch. ii.

² Cole, *Europe To-day*, pp. 660, 662, 666.

scientifically valid method of classifying men is by the way they earn their living.”¹ This is also Manu’s view, but in part only. When Marx goes on to propound that “On this view, modern society is divisible into two great groups, the capitalist and the wage-earner,”² he drifts far away from Manu’s thought, though his statement may be correct (even then scarcely quite³) as regards modern western society. The full view of Manu is that the scientifically valid method of classifying men is by the way they earn their living, and that they should enter appropriate callings and earn their living under guidance by the whole Scheme of Social Organisation and the Educational Department of the State, the Corporation or Guild of Educators, in accordance with appropriate temperamental aptitude and talent and not otherwise, nor should any person pursue more than one of the four main “ways of living” prescribed respectively for the four main kinds of dispositions and corresponding abilities.⁴

Society First, State Afterwards

Manu and the subsequent R̥shi law-givers of India have uniformly laid far greater stress on the Economic or rather Vocational Structure or Form of *Society*, the Varna-dharma (and the

¹ Laski, op. cit., pp. 67-’8.

² *Ibid.*

³ Cole, *Europe To-day*, pp. 694-’5.

⁴ *Manu-Smṛti*, iv, 2-6 ; x, 74-124.

interwoven Āshrama-dharma), than on the Political Form of its Government, of the compelling authority, which is what has been mainly signified hitherto by the word *State*. It has been the custom so far to speak of a State as either monarchical or republican or oligarchic, and more particularly of the nature and personnel of its government as autocratic, or bureaucratic, or responsible, or representative, or otherwise. Now, we are beginning to hear talk of imperialist, capitalist, militarist, individualist, socialist, communist, bolshevist, fascist, nazist, nationalist, etc., States, with regard to the *principles* of social structure, economic class-organisation, or "classlessness," the kind of class-consciousness, the kind of national consciousness, the outlook on total human life, the *philosophy* or "ideology" on the subject of gregarious human existence, which may be predominant within the territories of these States on the whole, and govern their general conduct. Manu's State, with reference to these latest ideas, is exactly describable as a Varn-Āshrama State. The main, almost the sole (but that is all-comprehensive) duty of the person or persons entrusted with the political power, the compulsive force, the duty of the Executive (always under supervision and guidance by the Elders, the 'men of wisdom,' constituting the Legislative)¹ is to see that

¹ See Bhagavan Das, *The Cruz in Politics, or Who should Be Legislators*.

the Varṇ-Āshrama Plan and conduct of Individual-Social and Socio-Individual Life proceeds smoothly. The ministrant and constituent, *nigraha* and *anugraha*, *shāntika* and *paushtika*, *kshēma* and *yoga*, or *insidāḍi* and *imḍāḍi*, functions of the State are arranged under this main function, as subdivisions thereof and are entrusted to different 'types' or 'classes' of persons.

Thus the judicial function should be entrusted to the person of the *brāhmaṇa* character and he must not be subordinated to the executive *kṣhatṛiya*. When, in 1933, the judges of the British High Court were subjected to the general salary-cut in consequence of the economic depression, in the way of routine, together with other public servants, they made formal public protest, feeling that an indignity had been put upon them, and said that they should have been requested to reduce their own salaries, which they would have done gladly—*because they were not servants of the Crown*. This is exactly the ancient idea, in new shape, that the *brāhmaṇa* must not be subservient to the *kṣhatṛiya*, the Church to the State, the Spiritual to the Temporal. But, then, the *brāhmaṇa* and the Church must not hold great estates or draw fat salaries, or extort enormous fees, or accumulate riches, or exercise any executive power, and they must lead austere, ascetic, benevolent, philanthropic lives, and be content with the necessities of life, and the highest honor. This they have

grievously failed to do; hence the loss of their moral power of direction over the *kshattriya* and the consequent general confusion. So, in the Ancient Scheme, the man of the *kshattriya* type was to possess and to exercise executive authority, but was not to gather wealth for himself; and the man of the *vaishya* temperament was to manage the finances and gather a reasonable amount of wealth, but was debarred from exercising power which belonged to the *kshattriya*, and from receiving such honor as was the due of the *brāhmaṇa* only.

Manu does not expressly say whether the Chief Executive shall be a hereditary king or an elected temporary president. He seems to be almost indifferent on the point, and only lays down the *qualifications* of the *rājā*,¹ which word includes all sorts of Chief Executives, permanent as well as temporary, as explained by later writers on the Law. And, as a fact, in the course of her long history, India has tried all sorts of political forms of government, autocratic monarchy, limited monarchy, di-archy (of two co-kings, as in Sparta), oligarchy, republic, etc.;² but through and under, or rather over, all of these, the quadruple-class-structure remained predominant, until the successful foreign invasions and conquests began (A.D.

¹ See *Ancient Solutions of Modern Problems*, by the present writer, pp. 45-49.

² K. P. Jayaswal, *Hindu Polity*; *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*; *M.-bh.*, *Shānti-parva*.

700-1000), after which, because of the degeneration of character of the people, especially of the "men of knowledge" and the "men of action," and the misapplications of Manu's principles, that structure began to disintegrate. Yet even so it has not quite disintegrated, yet. It should also be noted that Mahāvira Jina's and Buddha's protests against the "caste-system" were protests against its perversions, and were intended, though indirectly, to *reform* it into conformity with Manu's principles.

The Class-structure of Society and the Philosophies of Communism and Fascism

Both Communists and Fascists claim the German philosopher Hegel among their intellectual ancestors, along two divergent lines of thought which both converge in Hegel's own scheme, of course. It was a part of Hegel's philosophy "that the nation-State was the ultimate unit in human organisation, and, accordingly, the ultimate unit in human allegiance".¹ "Hegel taught that a people is not an accumulation of separate individuals artificially united by conscious agreement for their mutual advantage . . . but a spiritual unity for which and by which its members exist."² Hence the Fascist idea of the

¹ Laski, *Grammar of Politics*, p. 222.

² Major Barnes, *Fascism*, p. 37.

Corporate State, and the subordination of the Individual to the State, of the part to the whole. This is an echo of what might be described in Vedānta words as the subordination of the *Jīvātṃā* to the *Sūtrātṃā*, of the *vyashti* to the *samashṭi*. But being carried to an excess, the result is that "the general conception of Fascism is based on rigid hierarchy".¹ In practice, the rigid hierarchy becomes despotic bureaucracy; and this feature is common to both Communism and Fascism, (and also to State-Capitalism as in India). But such relentless subordination of the individual is an exaggeration of the half-truth that "each is for all". The other half of the truth is equally important, that "all is for each"; that the *Sūtrātṃā* is for the *Jīvātṃā*, also, as much as the latter is for the former.

Manu duly interweaves the two. His Āśrama-dharma of the Individual and his Varṇa-dharma of the Society are as warp and woof; for the individual is also a whole and not merely a part. The totality of *Jīvātṃās* is *Paramātṃā*, no doubt, but each *Jīvātṃā* is also the whole *Paramātṃā*, each *A'yn-i-mua'yyan* is also *A'yn-i-murakkab*, each *pind-ānda* is also a *brahm-ānda*, each *ālam-i-saghīr* is also an *ālam-i-kabīr*, each microcosm is also a macrocosm, the smallest sphere is as much a complete sphere as the largest, each infinitesimal is also an infinite.

¹ Luigi Villari, art.: "Fascism," in *Enc. Brit.*, 14th edn.

The dialectical process, of evolutionary "progress, which for Hegel is the movement towards perfect freedom"¹ by negation of negation, by sublation of the opposite, is said to have been specially appropriated by Marx and others, as the idea of the supremacy of the State was by the Fascists. But the disciples used it for purposes which negated and sublated those of their master. "As Feurbach and Strauss applied the Hegelian dialectic to the destruction of Christianity, so Marx applied it to the destruction of Capitalism," though "with Hegel . . . the doctrine became a doctrine of conservatism and enabled him to find in the absolute Prussian State the highest embodiment of freedom as a universal idea".²

In the Marxian theory, feudalism is superseded by the middle-class state of the squirearchy and the bourgeoisie, and the middle-class State by the proletarian State, which is finally to "wither away" of itself.³

If we add sacerdotalism at the beginning of the series, then, in the Indian terms, we might say that *brāhmaṇa-rājya*, hagiocracy, theocracy, popedom, sacerdotalism, has to be succeeded by *kṣhatṛriya-rājya*, feudalism, militarism, timocracy, bureaucracy; that, in turn, by *vaishya-rājya*, capitalism, plutocracy; that, finally, by *shūdra-rājya*,

¹ Laski, *Communism*, p. 57.

² *Ibid.*, 57-58.

³ *Ibid.*, 60-64, 145.

democracy, mobocracy, proletarianism, laborism, the dictatorship of the proletariat. This may have been the course of history in Europe, and may continue to be, there ; it does not seem to have been in India. Even in Europe, it has been such only ' by predominance ' of one of four co-efficient factors temporarily over the other three ; the other three have never been wholly voiceless, sub-servient, unassertive, ineffective. And it does not appear that ' the materialist interpretation of history ' explains, in tracing the successive emergence into power of the several factors, by negating, sublating, defeating the preceding possessor of that power, why and how there come to be, in human society, these factors and no others.

In India, Manu's Scheme explains, by psychological science, why there are four such factors, and, instead of holding that they are irreconcilable,¹ holds, for the same psychological reasons, that they are indispensable to each other, and deliberately and insistently endeavours to preserve a balance between them by various ' scientific ' devices which seem to have effected their purpose on the whole—with occasional disturbances, no doubt, but corrected before long, principally through the leadership of the ' men of wisdom,'—until the foreign invasions and conquests began which gradually destroyed the hold of the Ancient Scheme on the land, having themselves been made possible by an

¹ Laski, *Communism*, p. 129.

internal weakening and degeneration in the operation of that scheme and in the character of the people.

In respect of these classes, some of the *principles* of Fascism, (as distinguished from its *practice*), come near those of the Indian traditional Scheme. "The recognition of the *essential identity of interest*, between employers and employed, differentiates Fascist from Socialist trade-unionism; it also explains the different goals and diverse methods of the two schools of economic thought. Socialist trade-unionism works through the class struggle; Fascist syndicalism works through *class collaboration* and aims at organising the *Guild State* in which *all the factors* of production, *capital, scientific research, technical direction*, manual and clerical labor, are recognised as essential, each in their degree, their several interests being *conciliated and subordinated to the general or national interest of which they are an integral part . . .* The State is, not a mere *policeman* keeping order and seeing fair play, not an instrument at the service of a *party* or a class, not a force *dominating* but apart from the people, but the supreme expression of all forms of national life, to which none of its activities are extraneous. 'All within the state, nothing outside the state, nothing against the state' . . ." ¹ This last is the formula of Mussolini. The formula sounds very well. But equally well

¹ *Enc. Brit.*, art.: "Fascism," by L. Villari.

may it be claimed and uttered by the Communists. Indeed, Lenin said, "The whole of society will become one office and one factory,"¹ which means very much the same thing. In *practice*, also, both Russia and Italy are, to-day, *police-States*, and the Fascist Party is as rampant as the Communist Party, as *dominant* over the people.

It will be noted that in the above extract *rê* Fascism the italicised words, 'capital,' 'scientific' and 'technical,' and 'labor,' obviously indicate there of the four vocational classes, while the registered Fascists, like the registered Communists, constitute the fourth or executive or 'ruling' class.

These four 'types' of human beings, making the natural vocational 'classes,' are *needed* by every society, whatever its political or economic structure, whether capitalist or communist or fascist, monarchic or oligarchic or republican. Only if they are duly trained, balanced, utilised, will the Society and the State be truly civilised, the general well-being greatest.

"The Russians would appear to be making the same kind of mistake, though every detail is different. If your civilisation is to be based upon science and technology, it is clearly desirable that you should make their meaning and practice generally understood, and not relegate them (as until recently was the case in Britain) to a contemptuous second place, with their activities

¹ M. Hindus, *Humanity Uprooted*, p. 64.

subject to the brahminical and often uncomprehending control of a *ruling caste* brought up in another tradition. If your people, through historical causes, lack mechanical aptitude but need it for the country's economic sake, it is good educational business to encourage it. But even if the community's main preoccupation be with technology, it will need many other aptitudes in the people. *Pure science*, for instance; *business ability*; *administrative skill*; *literary and artistic talent*. The Russian experiment of a general *industrial* bias to education is bound to be unsuited to many children, and it cannot but fail to provide many trained *types*, who would be useful to the community. It can be justified as an emergency measure, but if it fossilises into a dogmatic and universal system, it will be bad."¹ Such are the remarks of a noted scientist who has observed the Bolshevik educational system on the spot. The italicised words, in this as in the earlier extract, readily indicate the same main four types or classes.

All this has been said to show that the four main vocational classes, instead of trying to abolish one another, must exist side by side, in order to make Society possible, and that, in this sense, it is impossible to make Society "classless".

¹ Julian Huxley, *A Scientist among the Soviets*, pp. 100-101 (pub. 1932).

Hegel's dialectical process is an echo of the Vedantic metaphysical process of *adhyāropa* and *apavāda*, (im-position, im-posture, deceitful and false mayavic sup-position of an endless succession of restless, finite, mortal Forms on, in, of, the Formless, then op-position or de-position, de-posing, repudiation, denial, negation, *na-iti*, of such forms, and, finally, composition or re-position, re-pose, rest, of the Formless Universal Self in its own eternal, infinite, immortal Being). Brahma or Paramātmā is *īṭara* of *īṭara* ('other' than 'other'), *viruddha* of *viruddha* (opposite of opposite), *vivarta* of *vivarta* (reverse of reverse), *anyat* of *anyat* (different from different), or, as the Sūfis might say, *ghair* of *ghair* (God is other than other-than-God); is Him-Self and Nothing-Else. In this description of the Absolute Spirit the whole movement of the beginningless and endless World-process, with all its puttings on and off of material forms on all scales of time and space by the Spirit, all its infinitely cyclical and spiral evolutions and involutions, is included.¹ So Hegel's "movement towards perfect freedom" is an echo of the Vedantic procession of every soul towards Moksha, freedom from bondage of all kinds, not only political and economic but physical and material generally. But Hegel's vision seems limited to the evolution of man

¹ For an attempt to expound the Vedantic dialectical process in modern terms, the reader, who may feel the needed curiosity, is referred to *The Science of Peace* by Bhagavan Das.

on this earth only, and, here too, only within the few thousand years covered by the history known to the west. Hence his language, though it may be helpful and illuminating for the western student, (the language of his brighter-and-clearer-
visioned precessor Fichte, from whom Hegel took the dialectical process of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, is much more lucid and luminous, from the standpoint of Vedānta), has not that fullness of significance which the words of the Vedānta have in their setting of the *Itihāsa-Purāṇa*, the History of the Universe and of Man (outlined anew in modern terms in H. P. Blavatsky's *The Secret Doctrine*).

As to Marx' use of Hegel's dialectic, to abolish a preceding by a succeeding 'cracy' or 'ism,' it might be justifiable if there were any inherently irreconcilable antagonism between their fundamental elements. There is not. What conflict appears is due only to the excess and exaggeration of any one above and beyond any other. As a fact, none of these four factors ever tries to wholly abolish any other. At the worst, one tries to *subjugate* all the others. Of course, this *may be said* to be a sort of negation, a negation of the *dues* and the just proportions of those others. But that is not what seems to be meant by the Communists. They speak of the complete abolition of all classes—other than the proletarian. They have not yet made it clear, it would seem,

as to what the status of the *muzhik* is to be. The indication is that, when the mechanisation and collectivisation of agriculture has been completed, he will have become a proletarian also. So far so good. But the scientist's critical observations quoted above ré Bolshevik education have to be borne in mind. When all the population of Russia has become "proletarian," they will be found naturally subdivided and *classed* into "proletarians of learning and art and science," "proletarians of administrative and executive ability," "proletarians of financial capacity and business skill," and "proletarians of manual labor." Between these there is no more inherent antagonism and op-position than there is between head, arms, trunk, and legs, or root, trunk, branches, and leaves, or husband, wife, child, and grandchild, or foundation, floor, wall, and roof. Rather is there a patent protagonism and com-position between them. All positively help and support each other, if and while they discharge their respective functions properly.

As to equality, it has been already shown that economic equality is *non est* in Bolshevik Russia. Equality in other respects too, between human being and human being, or class and class, is being perpetually negated. The Communist Party have obviously all the official "power and authority" in their hands. The 'high' offices of state, the army and the police are almost wholly manned by

its members. They have also most of the "comforts". The Proletarians have the most "money" and the greatest "comforts," excepting the very highest officials. The *Muzhik* has all the real "labor" and "hard work" and worst return, but he has, at the same time, least "discipline" and the most freedom to do with himself and "amuse" himself as he likes. Among the intelligent, there is "strife for special *distinction* or recognition . . . There is the appreciation of merit through bestowal of the *title* of 'hero of labor' and the *banner* of the 'red labor flag,' both, and especially the latter, conferring on the recipient, *honor, glory*, and a host of special *privileges*".¹ "In recognition of the splendid work *Professor Smirnov* of Moscow University is doing for medical *science*—he restored a dead man to life, forty-five minutes after the heart had ceased to beat—Stalin has presented him with the Order of Lenin, the *highest distinction* that the Soviet can bestow."² All this means that Bolshevik Russia suffers from the inescapable natural psychical human desire for inequality, the desire for honor, for superiority, for distinction, as much as any other country or people. The thing to see to is that the (1) distinction, the honor, (2) the power and privilege, (3) the wealth, (4) the play and amusement, are justly deserved and are *gladly given* and acquiesced in by the public, are

¹ M. Hindus, *Humanity Uprooted*, p. 84.

² *The Hindustan Times* (of Delhi), dated 13th March, 1934.

duly partitioned and *balanced* between the four classes, and are not seized forcibly, or misappropriated, or stolen by fraud, and are not grudged or resented by the public.

From the standpoint of Vedānta or Adhyātmaśāstra, then, on which Manu's Scheme is founded, it is an erroneous misuse of the Principle of the Rhythmic Swing of Self-Alienation and Self-Recognition, of Evolution and Involution, by which the (dialectic) Process of the World is governed, to try to justify by it, either any "absolute Prussian State" or any "absolute Proletarian Dictatorship."

More: According to Marx and Engels, "when classes disappear, the State will disappear also, since its *raison d'être* will have gone," it will "wither away".¹ Herein seems incarnate a tremendous fallacy. To bring it out another quotation is necessary. "If you say to the Bolshevik that his own dictatorship is the most hide-bound authority on earth, he will reply with no small show of vehemence that it is only a temporary phase. He will argue that his dictatorship, though indispensable, is only incidental to the

¹ Laski, *Communism*, p. 145. Curiously, Proudhon, the famous French Socialist, contemporary of Marx, though he opposed the latter's theory of communism on many essential points, yet also believed in an ultimate 'anarchy,' absence of all government of man by man, an echo of the Purāṇic legend of the Uṭṭara-Kurus and other communities and races of 'god-like' beings, who need and have no rulers, because each individual is 'perfect,' is *mukṭa*, and rules himself or herself perfectly. Some of Proudhon's ideas of 'mutualism' seem to distantly resemble Manu's, *rē* interest and barter.

transition from an individualist to a collectivist state of society, and destined like the state itself, the instrument through which the dictatorship exercises its will, to disappear in due course. Eventually there will be no ruling class—indeed no classes at all. There will be a classless society. Humanity will then consist only of producers, and the real power will be vested in the masses or producers, with nothing above them—neither God, angels, nor Church—to keep them in a state of subjection. All *authority*, initiative, and creative energy will derive from them . . . Eventually in this society the State is to disappear, and the task of *preserving order* or *enforcing social discipline*, should it be necessary, is to devolve on *productive organisms*.”¹ But we have seen that the “poison of

¹ M. Hindus, *The Great Offensive*, pp. 167-25. Compare the repeated generous promise of the British Government that it will be graciously pleased to grant Swa-raj to India as soon as India becomes worthy of and ready for it—some centuries if not millennia hence. Compare also the following: “Opponents accuse Fascism of crushing liberty; but the Fascists reply that if the freedom of the press is limited, and parties, other than the Fascist, are reduced to inactivity, the essential liberty of the people has been secured as never before—the freedom to work and to produce for the common good—and that only a strong Government like that of Signor Mussolini could achieve such a series of far-reaching and . . . necessary reforms, which Liberal Governments . . . had always failed to carry out owing to the *tyranny of parliamentary obstruction*. The people, Mussolini said, in July, 1924, never asked him to free them from a tyranny which did not exist, but asked for railways, houses, roads, bridges, drains, water, and light.” *Enc. Brit.*, 14th. edn., art.: “Fascism.” Such are always the replies of men *in* power to the men *without* power, everywhere. And, accordingly, even the wholly subservient Chamber of Deputies has been abolished from July,

power is notorious . . . and there is no theoretical reason why those who make the communist revolution or their successors should abdicate from the pleasant task of exercising authority over their fellows . . . And the State does not disappear in a flash, it 'withers away'; but that process is a long one, and no one can set out the limits of its duration".¹ And, further, the strongest point against the talk about disappearance of the state is, that on and to whomsoever "the task of preserving *order* or *enforcing social discipline*" devolves and the indispensable corresponding compelling force and authority are entrusted, whether he be producer or other, that person or body of persons *ipso facto* becomes the State. He or it will say like Louis XIV, "I am the State." In the alternative, we have to assume that all human beings will become angels, or indeed much more than angels, for did not the very *highest* Arch-angel Azazel become Satan himself, and the attendants of Vishnu, *viz.*, Jaya and Vijaya, become the monstrous titans, Hiranyāksha and Hiranya-kashipu? We must assume that they will become "perfect," will become Sons of

1934 in Italy, and the whole State is to depend on the benevolence and talents of Signor Mussolini. Benevolent despotism is no doubt better than malevolent despotism, *but*—it is very impermanent, as all history shows, and is generally succeeded shortly by the malevolent variety. Hence the absolute necessity for trustworthy and venerated representatives of the People to act as an independent Legislative to supervise and advise and check as necessary the Chief Executive of the State.

¹ Laski, *Communism*, pp. 86, 145.

God, Jīvan-mukṭas, Insān-ul-kāmils. Let us all devoutly hope that that stage will come some day to the Human Race—and all traditions speak of it; but no tradition seems to promise it so shortly as the Communists seem to have in mind; and Theosophy, as expounded in H. P. B.'s *The Secret Doctrine* and in *The Mahātmā Letters*, puts it very very far off.

Yet more: Metaphysics seems to say that, though the egos that make up the present Human Race—at very different stages of evolution as they are—may, nay must, all attain the wisdom of that Golden Age of the future, some day, in succession, other egos constituting other Races, with unwise, childish and youthful minds will be cropping up freshly and perpetually!

Yet more: what guarantee is there that the dialectic process itself will also wither away with the withering away of the State into the being of the 'producer-cracy'? Will it not continue and bring about a negation of the "producer-cracy" by some other known or unknown 'cracy'?

Curiously, as the other ideas of the Communists and Fascists are faint, confused, err-ant, partial echoes of Vedantic ideas, (and yet not curiously, since all misrepresentations and falsifications are only exaggerations or under-statements of part-truths which are all contained in their just proportions and thus reconciled in the Whole Truth), so too is this, of the succession of 'cracies' and 'isms'

and a final 'classless' society, a confused echo of the Puranic doctrine of the succession of the four Yugas, and the return to the first after the fourth, in repeated cycles. There is no distinction of classes or 'varṇas' in the Satya-Yuga, the 'Age of Truth,' also called Kṛta-Yuga, the 'Age of *Achieved* Perfection, when everything worth doing has been *done*'. The shape and size and density of the human body are also different then. Differentiation begins towards its end, is completed in the Tréṭa-Yuga, is strong in the Dvāpara, and excessive and internecine in the Kali-Yuga. After that it re-merges into the higher 'classlessness' and homogeneity (only comparative, since *any* manifestation out of the state of Sleep, Pralaya, Chaos, necessarily implies *some* heterogeneity) of the re-curring Satya-Yuga.

Whatever may be cast upon us by forces beyond our control, so far as the forces within our control can go, our plain duty seems to be to strive against class-war by bringing about a balance between the vocational classes. Communists believe Capital and Labor to be irreconcilable. It has been said before that they are no more irreconcilable than the stomach and the limbs. Even more expressly antagonistic factors, like extensor and contractor muscles, secretory and excretory organs, afferent and efferent nerves, nutritive and reproductive instincts, self-seeking and children-seeking cravings, matter-of-fact

realistic selfishnesses and idealistic romantic self-sacrifices, exhibitiv and inhibitive impulses, sympathetic and aggressive tendencies, have been balanced and reconciled by Mother Nature in the living Individual Organism. Why cannot Capital and Labor, and also Science and Valour, all four, be balanced and reconciled in the living Social Organism?

Indeed, when Lenin says, "The existence of the State proves that the class-antagonisms are irreconcilable,"¹ the rather obvious reply is that the State was invented by Humanity to be just the very means of reconciling these antagonisms, by restraining the excesses of the classes, balancing them, keeping them all in check, and each within due bounds. All the eastern and western theories as to the origin of the State mean just this.²

More: if class-antagonisms are irreconcilable, much more so are individual antagonisms, lusts, hates, greeds, prides, likes, dislikes, pugnacities, aggressivenesses, conceits, ambitions, jealousies, all the brood of the *shad-ripu*, 'the six internal enemies' and 'the seven deadly sins'. These will always need a State to "maintain order and enforce social discipline". Indeed, if the subject is scrutinised in the light of psychological science, it will appear that what Marx and others seem to

¹ Laski, *Communism*, p. 129.

² *Mbh.* Shānti-parva, chs. 58 and 66 (Kumbhakonam edn.)

regard as a species *per se* of 'Class-antagonisms are really nothing else than these 'Individual antagonisms' grouped in masses, by the usual policies of alliances for purpose of offence and defence, and that they will reappear inevitably even after the whole population of a country, or the whole world, has been dubbed "Proletarian".¹ We have seen before that the separation of the two Marxian classes, of Bourgeois and Proletarian, was very far from complete in Russia when the Revolution came; and it is very far from complete in the other western countries. There is a broad intermediate fringe. No doubt there is a tendency to centralisation of capital in fewer hands. But there is a counter-tendency towards dispersal also; and many of the largest businesses are owned by many, even though mostly passive, shareholders. In political history we see that small chieftaincies are absorbed into larger and larger kingdoms, and these into empires. But we also see that blood-cemented empires are very unstable and short-lived; few have lasted more than one or two centuries, and have broken up into kingdoms again. So it is in economic history. Multi-millionaires become such by ruining myriads of small property-holders; and then the huge fortunes get scattered.

¹ See M. Hindus, *The Great Offensive*, pp. 232-3, for an account of an extra self-important and insolent proletarian being beaten by a crowd because he "had become so inflated with class-egotism that he thought he could force exceptional privileges for himself in the face of the crowd's disapproval".

Unity and Multiplicity both are operant everywhere and always in Nature.

The only cure for disorder is the State, and, any way, pending the arrival of the happy time when it will not be needed, will wither away and disappear of itself, it is the bounden duty of us all, on pain of enslavement, to see that Humanity, in every country, sets up the best possible form of Society and of State.

To some of us it seems that the best form of Society is that in which Science-power, Valour-power, Bread-power, and Labor-power are duly balanced, and are not at the mercy any one of any other, yet are thoroughly and inextricably *inter-dependent*; and the best form of State is that in which the Chief and the subordinate Executive are duly supervised and guided by a Legislative composed of the men and women of wisdom, *i.e.*, experienced knowledge plus philanthropy, who are the trusted, honored, elected representatives of the four 'powers' and the four classes of the people, and embody in themselves the higher, better, wiser Self, the finer half of human nature, and thus constitute the essential central core of true Self-government.

The spirit of anti-parliamentarianism and anti-democracy that has successfully asserted itself in the Dictatorialised countries, and is gathering strength in others, is wholly and solely due to the fact that the so-called representatives elected by the

people are utterly unworthy, ethically as well as intellectually, for the most part not embodiments of the higher Self, the higher nature of humanity, but of the lower self, the lower nature.¹

Such then are the pros and the cons of Communist and Fascist theory and practice, the great deal of good that there is in them and the grievous defects that seriously endanger and vitiate that good. Theosophists have to decide for themselves and for those for whom they feel responsible, whether the Communists, or the Fascists, or any other type of Socialists, or Modified Capitalists, or Manu's Guild-Socialist Varn-āshram-ists (*not* the present-day gross caricature and perversion and corruption, of some three thousand mutually 'touch-me-not castes by birth') give us the best solutions of the problems that are oppressing the hearts and harassing the minds of all human beings to-day.

*The Ancient Scientific Guild-Socialism, or
The Four Guilds State*

It is well-known that for thousands of years, in India, the names of the four vocational classes have been, Brāhmaṇa, Kṣhatriya, Vaishya, Shūdra. Etymologically and psychologically they respectively connote (1) 'the man of Brahma, the

¹ See Bhagavan Das, *The Crux in Politics, or Who Should Be Legislators*, for full quotations from modern and ancient writers, in illustration of this and the previous paragraph.

man of God and of *God-and-Nature-Knowledge*, the Knower and Teacher of the laws of God's Nature,' (2) 'the man of *Action*, especially of protective action, the *Protector* from *injury*, the Ad-ministra-tor,' (3) 'the man of *Desire*, the man who has *settled* on the land whence alone are derived all life-supporting, life-enriching, consumable, usable, and tradeable *goods*, the farmer, the man of *Weal-th*,' and (4) 'the *quick Runner*, who carries out the instructions of elders quickly, the man of undifferentiated, unskilled, or little-skilled Labor.' These ancient words, very significant, useful, practical, in their day, have now become very misleading because of incurably erroneous associations of crass and rigid 'heredity'; though the scriptures, *Upanishads*, *Gītā*, *Smṛtis*, *Itihāsas*, *Purāṇas*, all repeatedly raise the question, and repeatedly decide that true *varṇa*, vocational class (now usually translated as 'caste'), is determined not by *janma* or birth but by *guṇa* and *karma*, 'disposition' and 'action,' 'natural quality' and 'occupation,' 'temperament' and 'spontaneous variation,' 'characteristic inclination' and 'means of livelihood or way of living pursued.' In view of these very misleading and very persisting associations, it seems desirable now to replace them with other names. Even less fine but strong new clothing is better than the most splendid old garments if they have become irreparably tattered. To express the same

psychological significance, in Samskr̥t terms, some such quartettes may be used as, (1) Shikshaka, (2) Rakshaka, (3) Poshaka, (4) Sahāyaka; or (1) Jñāna-dāṭā, (2) Tṛāṇa-dāṭā, (3) Anna-dāṭā, (4) Sahāya-dāṭā; or (1) Viḍwān, (2) Vīra, (3) Dānī, (4) Sévī; or (1) Jñānī, (2) Shushmī, (3) Vyāpārī, (4) Shramī; or (1) Varchaswī, (2) Tējaswī, (3) Mahaswī, (4) Taraswī; or (1) Tapaswī, (2) Sashaswī, (3) Ojaswī, (4) Ramhaswī; or (1) Jñān-ādhika, (2) Kriy-ādhika, (3) Ichchh-ādhika, (4) Bāly-ādhika; or (1) Prajñā-vān, (2) Shaurya-vān, (3) Īhā-vān, (4) Druṭi-mān; or (1) Saṭṭv-ādhika, (2) Raj-odhika, (3) Tam-odhika, (4) Avyakṭa-guṇa; etc. In Persian-Arabic, equivalents would be (1) Ul-ul-I'lm or Ul-ul-Albāb, (2) Ul-ul-Amr, (3) Ul-ut-Taḡr, (4) Ul-ul-Mashq or Ul-ul-Mehn or Ul-ul-Muzḍ; or (1) A'lim or Ā'rif or Hākīm, (2) Āmir or Amīr or Hākīm, (3) Tāḡir or Rāyī, (4) Mazḍūr; or (1) Maulavī or Mua'llim, (2) Hāfiz or Mahāfiz, (3) Mukḡayyar or Ahl-i-Daul, (4) Maḡaḡ-gār; etc. In English, corresponding words would be (1) Men of Knowledge, (2) Men of Action, (3) Men of Desire, (4) Men of Labor; or (1) Educators, (2) Protectors, (3) Feeders, (4) Helpers; or (1) Teachers, (2) Defenders, (3) Nourishers, (4) Assistants; or (1) the Wise, (2) the Chivalrous, (3) the Generous, (4) the Helpful; or (1) the Scientist, (2) the Soldier, (3) the Trader, (4) the Laborer; or (1) the Intellectual Worker, (2) the Watch-and-Ward Worker; (3) the Wealth Worker, (4)

(4) the Manual Worker; or (1) the Book-man, (2) the Army-man, (3) the Trades-man, (4) the Work-man, etc.

The older western names in English were (1) Clergy, (2) Nobility, (3) Commons, (4) Yeomen, or (1) Priests, (2) Knights, (3) Burghers, (4) Journeymen, etc.—the four natural estates of every civilised realm. Other European languages had other corresponding names. Thus, in German, (1) Lehr-stand, (2) Wehr-stand, (3) Nahr-stand, mean respectively those who are employed (1) in teaching, (2) in the army, (3) in commerce.¹ But the English quartette, like the Samskr̥t, have fallen on evil times and developed wrong 'caste'-like associations which are now indefeasible. They have therefore to be cast aside also and substituted by some new set, as suggested above, which will display the basis of the classification in psychological science more plainly and unmistakably. As said before, the new Russia began as a Soviet Republic of (Intellectual and Manual) 'Workers, Soldiers, Peasants,' which had psychological truth and value in it, but has now changed into 'Communists, Proletarians, and Muzhiks' which carries no such permanent significance on its face.

¹ Prof. J. S. Mackenzie, *Fundamental Problems of Life*, p. 215 (pub. 1928). With reference to the word Protector, it may be noted that the (in this case) right instinct of the British People gave to Oliver Cromwell the title of the Protector, which history continues. It is the temperamental function and duty of the *kṣat̥triya* "to ride abroad redressing human wrongs."

The fourfold classification is inevitable so long as human beings have bodies differentiated into head, arms, trunk, and legs, or nervous, muscular, glandulo-vascular, and skeletal systems, and minds performing functions distinguishable as cognition, action, desire, and memory. When, ages and eons hence, they re-assume, on a higher level, the homogeneous spheroidal form of (ethereal) physicality, and uni-form prayer-like mood of mentation, which they had at the beginning of cyclic evolution (as hinted in Purāṇic and theosophical, and even Plato's legends, and as amoeba have to-day), then indeed, such classification will become unnecessary.

Far-sighted and fore-sighted Planning, which alone can justify human reasoning faculty, by co-operation between the trusted leaders of the four Guilds, should ensure 'necessaries,' food, clothing, housing, tools, to all who are not deliberate shirkers; for, as the scriptures say, "Those who will not work, neither shall they eat." Comforts and luxuries, over and above the necessities, should be earnable by all in accord with the quality of their work. Honor, the psychic and highest luxury (enjoyable *post mortem* also), as his best heart nourishment and incentive, should be given *in excelsis* to 'the man of wisdom,' 'the man of the learned professions,' who lives perpetually the life of the ascetic in order to perfect his wisdom more and more. Official Power or

Authority, the next in the scale of luxuries, psycho-physical, incentive as well as necessary means of discharge of his duty, should be given primarily to 'the man of chivalrous valour,' 'the man of the executive professions,' who also has to live austere and refrain from sense-indulgence in order to keep himself 'hardy' and fit for his particular function in the social organisation. Wealth, third in the scale, physico-psychical incentive, should be allowed to 'the man of the mercantile professions.' Play, Amusement, holidays, fairs, *mélās*, *ṭamāsha-s*, shows, (*panem et circenses*, more physical than psychical incentive, naturally belong to the unevolved, undifferentiated, child-mind, 'the man of the laboring professions'; such holidays and amusements, if properly planned, as they should be, give him not only the needed healthy heart-satisfaction, the pleasure, the *ānanda*, the *kṛhshī*, which is the very essence of nourishment and growth, but also the education, in the pleasantest and most easily and completely assimilable form, which helps his intellectual and emotional evolution forward. All these four luxuries should be dissociated from each other, as far as possible. This is of course said 'comparatively,' 'relatively'; not 'absolutely'—which is impossible. What is possible, and necessary, is that the highest honor should never be given to any other than the most learned, experienced, virtuous, 'man of wisdom'; the greatest power

of authority, never entrusted to any other than the ablest 'protector'; the largest wealth, never allowed to any other than the most prudent 'benefactor'; the heartiest play, never provided for any other than the 'workman'. This partition of 'luxuries,' side by side with functions, is to be found even in capitalist societies to-day, because forced by Nature; but in a confused form, wholly marred by jealousies, conflicts, grabbings at all the perquisites of all the others by every one—because the *psychological* laws are not *recognised* consciously and *submitted to* contentedly and peacefully.¹ The difference between the two is that of surreptitious concubinage and publicly celebrated and therefore sanctified marriage. Especially to-day has the 'ad-ministra-tor' succeeded in converting himself into the 'bureau-crat' and 'ruler,' not responsible to any one else, not questionable by even the 'scientist' and 'priest,' *because* the latter has lost 'ascetic virtue' and therefore 'wisdom' and 'soul-force'; and he, the 'govern-or,' the 'dictator,' thus manages to enjoy the highest honor, as well as the greatest power and the greatest wealth (in the public treasury as well as personal high salary), and also all the most luxurious and sensuous amusements.

¹ *Vide* the discussion of extracts from Bhagavan Das, *Social Reconstruction, with special reference to Indian Problems*, in J. S. Mackenzie, *Fundamental Problems of Life*, p. 212, *et seq.*

Especially must wealth be dissociated from honor and power, in its accumulative stage. Honor should be given to it, in appropriate degree, after it has been spent in public benefactions.

A healthy, righteous, jealousy against encroachment on one another's rights, duties, means of living, functions, in the Scheme of Social Labor, should be fostered to preserve the balance of power between the classes within the Society.

All this is done by the Ancient Socialism.

The Purāṇas say that in Kali-yuga, the Age of Discord, Competition, Conflict, Hatred (the literal meaning of the word *kali*), Kali, the Purāṇic Satan, will reside in "Gold," his favorite "playgrounds will be gambling-houses, drinking-places, brothels, and slaughter-houses," and he will take joy in "deceit, pride, lust, jealousy, and hate."¹ The story of Modern Capitalism and the world-wide martial and economic wars engendered by it, writes the full commentary on this ancient allegory and proves how profoundly true it is. "Gold" is able to purchase to-day (not honor but) honors, (not always official authority but) powers, (not artistic psychical joy but) all sensuous luxuries and amusements, and can suborn and command the services of even science and valour, and openly and brazenly makes a slave of labor. Hence its relegation, in the Ancient Scheme, to the third place in the Social Order of Precedence,

¹ *Bhāgavata*, I, ch. 17.

and its dissociation from honor, power, play, whereby it loses almost all its otherwise overpowering evil attractions and temptations and possibility of misuse.

Since Capital, in the sense of money as mechanism of exchange, is indispensable, and at the same time excessive accumulation of it in any pair of hands is very dangerous ; since absolute economic equality is impossible, but equitability in the distribution of wealth is necessary ; since without *some personal* incentive, whether refined or unrefined, human beings do not put forth their best, and yet also unrestrained competition is disastrous ; therefore the principles of Ancient Socialism seem to suggest that, in modern conditions, a lower limit or minimum of necessities, in the way of food, clothing, housing, tools of occupation, should be fixed for all alike, by the Legislature, in accordance with the principle of 'plain living' and with the circumstances of the country, in terms of the current means of exchange, as a 'living wage,' (prices being regulated by the Guild of Feeders, with the consent of the Legislature) ; and that, over and above this minimum, which, with corresponding employment should be assured to all who are able and willing to work, and without employment to those who are unable to work through no fault of their own, (1) *Honoraria*, not exceeding a higher limit or maximum, which should be a multiple of the lower limit above-mentioned, should be

presented to the men and women of the learned professions, to enable them to secure comforts and 'psychical' luxuries, according to taste, to the quality of their work, and to the rank assigned to them by their Guild; (2) *Salaria* should be furnished to the men and women of the executive professions, similarly, the higher limit in this case being higher than that in the preceding case, for more physical comforts and appliances are needed by them to keep themselves strong, hardy, and fit for their special duties; (3) *Profits* should be allowed to the persons engaged in the wealth-making professions, (farming, trading, banking, managing of mines, factories, large machinery, etc.), the higher limit being considerably higher than that in the second case; (4) *Wages* should be supplied to the persons engaged in the laboring professions, the higher limit being put somewhat lower than in the first case, appropriate play and amusements being supplied to them free by the other Guilds. The word 'work,' used above, has to be interpreted liberally, so as to include any and every form of physical or mental activity that is even distantly useful, helpful, healthily agreeable, to other human beings.

Some Concrete Suggestions

To illustrate the above ideas some suggestions may be made in more concrete form.

The average income of the Indian, beggar and millionaire all included, is said to be, at the present time, about seven pice per day, or three rupees and four annas and a half per month, in terms of present Indian currency. Estimates vary, but almost none goes higher than four rupees per month. There is also probably much erroneous doubling in calculation; since, if an individual has ten lakhs of rupees a year, he has thousands of salaried employees under him whose salaries all come out of this ten lakhs. The real annual income of a People, in terms of money, is only the coin-value of the raw materials, convertible into consumable and usable goods, which they produce annually out of the Earth (including the waters and the atmosphere).¹ It is therefore difficult to say, without prolonged and careful statistical enquiry and calculation, what the really exact average income is. For present purposes we may

¹ See pp. 33-39, *supra*. Fluid money-capital, very useful, even necessary, within limits, when it develops a fascinating glamour and runs to excess, then it becomes a source of enormous and many-sided corruption, as other good things run to excess become in differing degrees, and ruins nations. It has been remarked by some historians that at least one of the causes of the downfall of Rome was its discovery of fluid capital, thence enormous growth of usury and of private fortunes, and the indebtedness and enslavement of vast numbers of the population, and consequent widespread discontent, disappearance of the patriotic sentiment, and general weakening of the spirit of resistance against foreign invasions, on the one hand, and, on the other, increasing temptations to foreigners to make such invasions.

For the special applicability of these considerations to the case of India, see Bhagavan Das, *Annie Besant and the Changing World*, pp. 18-23.

fairly put it at four rupees per month.¹ But it is well-known, as has been admitted even in official publications, which are not likely to exaggerate the poverty of the people, in view of the excessive salaries of the high officials, that forty to fifty millions out of the three hundred and twenty-five do not get even one full meal per day, and live on in a condition of semi-starvation month after month, year after year, clothed in rags, while hundreds of thousands die like flies in famines and epidemics for lack of stamina. The average for this mass of paupers would be nearer two, at most three, than seven pice per day. The average for the next hundred and fifty millions would be four or five pice, one pence in English money, or a penny and a quarter. It should be borne in mind that over 85 p.c. of the population consists of agriculturists, mostly very small, with minutely divided plots of land to till. The next hundred millions would probably average three to four annas a day. The remaining twenty-five millions would be found to have 'comforts,' while the topmost layers of these would have all the 'luxuries,' almost all living in the great towns. Thus, in the United Provinces, with a total population of nearly fifty million, there are only about nine

¹ Viceroy Curzon, in 1900, put it at two rupees and a half p.m.; Mr. Findlay Shirras, in 1911, at a trifle over four rupees p.m., or fifty per year; Prof. K. T. Shah, in 1921, at a trifle under, or forty-six per year; Sir M. Viswesariah, in 1933, at sixty rupees per year, or five p.m.

hundred landholders who pay five thousand rupees or more, of which about two hundred pay twenty thousand or more, as Government revenue, which is generally fixed at about half of the total collections of rent from the tenants. But, then, among these two hundred, there are a number of zaminḍār or landholder rājās and mahārājas (as distinguished from 'ruling' rājās and mahā-rājās) whose annual rent-rolls range from one to twenty-five lakhs of rupees a year and more. In a town like Benares, about the tenth in India, in respect of population and 'business'-importance, not many more than a hundred persons pay 'income-tax' (which landholders do not have to pay) on incomes exceeding ten thousand rupees a year.

With such a very low average before us for the vast bulk of the population, in order to convert the present excessive iniquity of enormously far apart extremes into an equitability in which they would be nearer to each other, by levelling up on the one side and levelling down on the other, the State may well fix a single adult working person's plainest necessities at ten rupees p.m. (which is at present, in the U.P., considered a decent wage for an unskilled laborer). The higher limit of remuneration, for skilled labor, may be fixed at, say, ten times as much; for the learned professions, twenty-five times as much, plus *ex-officio* expenses, if any; for the executive

or administrative professions, a hundred times, besides all *ex-officio* expenses, free quarters, conveyance, travel, etc.; for the wealth-making professions, five hundred (or even a thousand) times, nett, after paying all business-charges.

In judging these suggested figures—which will probably be objected to very strongly, on opposite grounds, by the rank communist on the one hand, and the arrant plutocrat, bureaucrat, timocrat, aristocrat, theocrat, technocrat, expertocrat, on the other—the reader may well bear in mind the fact that, while the average income of the vast mass is from one to three rupees per month, the highest salary, of a Chancellor of a University, a Provincial Director of Public Instruction, a Minister for Education, an Educational Commissioner with the Government of India, ranges at present from two to five thousand rupees p.m. and more; the income of a successful novel-writer in England goes up to fifty thousand *pounds* a year; the heads of some of the great schools and colleges, and the bishops, get five to six thousand pounds, and the Archbishops and the Lord Chancellor ten thousand pounds, a year; the cleverest practising lawyers make twenty thousand pounds or three lakhs of rupees a year in England and India; and physicians and surgeons of the top-rung have begun to charge a thousand rupees per diem now. The lowest salary, of a village schoolmaster, in India, is ten

to fifteen rupees p.m. So far, the 'learned professions'.

As to the Executive, the salaries range, in India, from about ten to fifteen rupees p.m. for a chaprāsī-peon, a village patwarī-recorder, a constable, one thousand for a district superintendent of police, two thousand for a district magistrate, to three, five, seven thousand for Ministers and Executive Councillors, ten thousand for the provincial Governors and the Commander-in-Chief, and twenty thousand for the Governor-General and Viceroy, besides free palaces and sumptuary allowances of some thirty thousand rupees p.m. more for the Viceroy, and heavy allowances of various sorts for the others.

Among the ruling chiefs, who obviously belong to the 'Executive department' in the Social Structure, the Nizam is said to have an income of some crores of rupees per year from his private properties, entirely apart from the State revenues, which also, in the false and perverse theory and worse practice current now, under the British régime, in the Indian States, are at the disposal of the will and the wilfulness of their Autocrats, whom none can question—except the British-Indian Political Department whose 'obedient servants' they are. And there are quite a number of such 'autocrat' Mahārājas, Nawābs, Rājās, with revenues of forty, fifty, eighty lakhs of rupees a year, and three or four

with more than one, two, or even five crores a year.¹

Apart from the ruling chiefs, there are the *zaminḍār rājās* and *mahārājas*, simple landholders without any ruling powers, paying revenue to the British-Indian Government. In the Ancient Socialism, of Manu and Vyāsa, the *bhū-pālas*, and even under the Mughal régime, (which largely copied the old) the *zamīn-dārs*, were (etymologically and) officially, 'the *protectors* of the land,' state-officials with executive revenue-collecting and policing duties.² Under the present régime, they have, for various reasons, become '*proprietors* of the land,' collecting rents from tenants and paying revenue to the Government, without any other duties, in several provinces, while there are none in the others. Theoretically, they must continue to be regarded as part of the Executive. Now, public report says that one of the wealthiest of these had a clear nett income, from his land, after paying government revenue and collection expenses, of from forty to fifty lakhs of rupees per year.

¹ For the great fall in status, during the last three decades, *vis-a-vis* the British-Indian Political Department, of the ruling princes, side by side with the increase in their claims of autocracy over their 'subjects,' see, *e.g.*, Nicholson's *Scraps of Paper*; and the accounts of the depositions and externments of half-a-dozen or more, during the last two decades. For the nature of the personal life led by a number, see *e.g.*, K. L. Gauba's *The Pathology of Princes*.

² *Manu*, ch. vii.

In the 'business-professions,' successful 'speculators' and business-'gamblers' in India also, in imitation of the business-'kings' of the west, now and then make tens of lakhs of rupees by single coups, and quite possibly the income-tax lists, if published, might show at least a few single individuals with incomes of forty to fifty lakhs in a single year. The wealthy zamindār-mahārājā above-mentioned, was reputed to be making as much from his investments as from his lands for many years before he died, some time ago. His successor presumably enjoys the same income if he is as clever a business-man. The predecessor was a very 'careful' person, and had the ambition of becoming the richest man in India, adulterating the administrator's with the banker's and trader's *rights*, unable to discharge the *duties* of either. Vain ambition—with the Nizam in existence, who is rivalled, perhaps outrivalled, in actual wealth, by the Fords and the Rockefellers of the U.S.A.

In view of such figures and the atrociously inhuman iniquity of disproportion that they show between the lowest and the highest incomes, the figures suggested above for the lower and the higher limits, as a middle course, of equitability, between unrestrained grab-as-grab-can, 'let him take who has the power and let him keep who can,' on the one hand, and an enforced, dulling, deadening, and indeed impossible, absolutely

equal distribution, on the other, may not appear utterly absurd, to either socialist or capitalist, but only debatable in regard to the amounts and the proportions of the limits. It cannot be repeated too often that excess is the one sin of sins. Excess of capitalist-imperialist-militarist fury of grab and consequent upsettal of all social balances is the one disease of the human world to-day. Only the balance of the classes has to be restored, to restore that world to complete health.

Ten rupees p.m. for a single individual is, to-day, in the U.P., enough to cover plain food, clothing, room-rent; it is regarded as fair and sufficient wage for an unskilled day-laborer or domestic servant, by the latter himself. Twenty rupees for man and wife (if she does appropriate work also), with provision for maternity and child-welfare up to a limit of two or three children, would be considered a blessing by the poorer classes, especially the peasants. Ten times this, as higher limit, for skilled manual worker; twenty-five times for the worker in the gathering and the spreading of knowledge; a hundred times, for the executive worker; five hundred (or even a thousand) times for the gatherer and distributor of necessities, comforts, physical luxuries; this should meet all physical and psychological requirements.¹ The wife of any one, by pursuing the

¹The fixing of any higher limit, by itself, in terms of an absolute figure, seems to be a grave psychological mistake.

appropriate occupation, might earn up to as much as her husband, and thus double the household's income. After all, even the Nizams, Fords, Rockefellers, cannot eat, or wear, or really occupy, very much more, or indefinitely more expensive, food or clothing or housing. Indeed, many of them come to suffer from dyspepsia and neurasthenia and worse diseases, and eat and drink much less, if they do not quite die from the diseases; some even suffer surfeit and commit suicide. Their only joy is the false and feverish psychical joy of an excessive egoism, *mama-tā*, sense of 'mine-ness,' 'I am the owner of all this'. The joy of spending their surplus on public works as systematically planned by the wise, and receiving public honor in return, would be the true, the great, the healthy joy of a reasonable degree of egoism and sense of wealthiness. To the hungry man, the first morsel is the most precious and delicious; the next, less; the third, still less; after repletion, every morsel is poison. It is the same with private possessions, property, riches; after certain limits, they become a burden, a worry, a feverish misery instead of a

Such a mistake has been committed, *e.g.*, by the Karachi Congress of 1931, which in a resolution regarding the future Constitution of India says, "no servant of State ordinarily to be paid above Rs. 500 per month"; but does not fix any higher or lower limits for any other vocation. The fixing of higher and lower limits by *raito* to one another, and differently for the different vocations, seems to be demanded by psychology, to avoid arbitrariness, show human and humane reasonableness and sense of proportion on its face, and make increase or decrease, *throughout*, automatic.

joy. Also, when public possessions are rich and plentiful and available to all for recreation, when 'parks of culture and rest and enjoyment' are abundantly and appropriately spread all over the land, (as great temples, cathedrals, mosques, mausolea, with well-kept precincts, and many institutions of public utility attached to and maintained with them, were in the medieval ages of east and west alike), then the need and the greed for much private hoarding and owning, with all its worry of guarding and maintaining, will also automatically decrease.

All the money that any financier or merchant might make beyond his higher limit, need not, and ordinarily should not, be taken away from him. After the annual accounting, before the Managing Committee or Presidium of the third Guild, it might be left with him, in trust, as a deposit, to be spent by him, on public works, as directed.¹ His great satisfaction would be in his being the agent of the benefaction and the recipient of compensatory recognition and honor from the State and the Public. If necessary, for special reasons, the surplus might be transferred to the Public Treasury, which would be in charge of the third Guild, and *not* of the second Guild. The third Guild would spend the public monies in its charge, on public works and services, in accordance with the instructions of the Central Legislature,

¹ See G. R. S. Taylor, *The Guild-State*, p. 67, (pub. 1919).

principally through the Budget, and under the expert detailed guidance, of the first Guild. The second Guild would only exercise supervision to make sure that the instructions were properly carried out and there was no embezzlement.¹ The Public Treasury should *not* be at the command of the Executive, for that would at once corrupt the spirit of the latter and convert it into the typical Bureaucracy, always increasing its own salaries and powers, its perquisites and bribes and black-mail.

As this is being written, there appears in the dailies,² a report from Moscow, based on statements published by the Soviet press, of "large-scale thefts of goods from Government organisations, misappropriation of public funds, and unlawful speculation in goods and funds by responsible and trusted officials. The incidents occur in all sections of the country and in a wide variety of organisations, which suggests that there has been little essential change in the nature of the typical Russian *chinovnik* or petty official, since the Revolution. Previously he got his perquisite through an open and well-recognised system of

¹ At hasty and cursory first glance it might appear as if all this means a complete turning upside down of the current systems of government. It does not. It means only some decentralisation, a greater separation of constituent and ministrant functions, and more autonomy in the discharge of each.

² *Vide* article quoted from the *Manchester Guardian*, in the *Leader* (of Allahabad), dated 11th August, 1934.

bribery" (as in all capitalist and imperialist countries, now, especially India under the current régime); "that is infrequent now, but peculations take its place. The *difference* for the *chinovnik* now is that the Government *strikes* harshly and ruthlessly when the evil comes to light, but undoubtedly there are many peculations which remain hidden in the mazes of *bureaucracy*." This is a *very great difference* from past Russia, and present India, and U.S.A., and Britain, and other capitalist-bureaucratist-jingoist countries, where *esprit de corps* and views as to the need of keeping up official 'prestige' very often *hush up* reports of, and thereby promote, vice and crime among officials.¹ The report from Moscow goes on to say that "the Government's determination to keep the evil down to a minimum is shown in the increase in the severity of sentences passed on offenders and a rise in the number of death sentences; it is noteworthy that the death sentence is again becoming common after a lapse of several years"; and mentions specific cases of peculations in "the Kiev baking trusts," "the building of a branch railway line from Briansk to Vyazma," "the huge organisation, Metrostroï, built up to construct Moscow's first underground railway," "the

¹ Besides these judicial punishments of criminal officials, Bolshevism has also to its credit periodic extensive 'confessional' 'cleansings' and 'purges' of the public services and the Communist party; Cole, *Europe To-day*, p. 390, and M. Hindus, *The Great Offensive*, p. 176.

co-operative stores of Central Asia, so that a combination of these embezzlements and mis-managements has brought the co-operative system in this extensive area to a state of chaos," and so forth. The report ends with the statement that "the Communist party committee in Central Asia is mobilising two thousand young Communists to replace incompetent and untrustworthy managers, salesmen, and book-keepers in the co-operative system".

What is the lesson of the above? The mere replacement of old hands by new hands is not enough. Presumably the old hands began also as enthusiastic 'young Communists,' but the enthusiasm gradually faded, the young became older, primitive instincts, not checked by psychologically 'scientific socialist' devices, re-asserted themselves, and they succumbed to temptation. The new hands will go through the same cycle, very likely. What is wanted is a change, not of persons only, but of principles and system also. The work of the State, and corresponding rights, duties, remunerations, rewards, must be divided up between Four main Guilds, *healthily jealous* of each other; and even the most romantically pure Communistic Sir Galahads must not be entrusted with Finance-power as well as Official-Authority-power as well as power over Science and over Labor. Critics are not wanting who say that Bolshevism has really done not much more than to substitute a,

for the time being, better Communist bureaucracy in place of the Czarist bureaucracy.¹

As to the much used word 'efficiency,' Company Railways, *e.g.*, are generally better and more 'efficiently' managed than State Railways. Company employees do not feel and behave to the public as self-important 'officers,' as State-employees generally tend to do. They consult the convenience of the public much more carefully and courteously. They understand and conduct the financial and economic side of the 'business' better also. The two types of mind are different.² What is needed is the prevention of 'profiteering' and wasteful competition between rival companies or 'trusts' or associations. This is done best through supervision by the State-Executive under the general direction of the State-Legislative.

If, in the expenditure on public works and institutions, by the third Guild, arrangements are made for the special association, in suitable ways, of those who contribute surpluses of income, as above suggested, and for the recognition of them as donors, it will be a very great inducement to all wealth-makers to feel and act as public *trustees* more and more.

That the higher limits suggested above are not altogether fanciful or laughable, at least so far as the learned and the executive professions

¹ *Twelve Studies in Russia*, pp. 137, 144.

² See *Ibid.*, pp. 72, 87, 137-144, 197, 204.

are concerned, may be shown by the practical example of Japan and Italy, and of course the new Russia, where these limits, to-day, are about the same as those suggested here. As to the separation of executive-work and 'business'-work, Fascist Italy makes it, at least in theory;¹ and Bolshevist Russia also does it practically, for its Artels, Trade-Unions, Co-operatives, Collectives, etc., are run largely on the lines of corresponding associations in capitalist countries, though with greatly restricted profits, and the great State concerns are also conducted similarly, with separate accounts, etc., the difference being that the State is the ultimate owner, and the managing staff are officials—with the result, as foreign observers say, of very great 'inefficiency'.²

If may also be noted that until not so very long ago, that is, while yet the influence of the British régime had not wholly permeated into and pervaded the Indian States, it was a frequent practice, in them, for the ruling chief to request the heads of the banker's and merchants' guilds to pay for, and get constructed, some public work urgently needed by the people, and they gladly did so in the spirit of doing 'pious' works. The tradition of the Ancient Socialism, on the subject, is expressly stated in the old books,

¹ Villari, *The Awakening of Italy*, pp. 134-135; *Enc. Brit.*, 14th edn., art. "Fascism". Indian government forms all fail.

² M. Hindus, *Humanity Uprooted*, pp. 333-335 and J. Huxley, *A Scientist among the Soviets*, pp. 78-79.

Yajñāya sṛṣṭāni dhanāni Dhātṛā. (*Mbh.*)

“Riches were created by the Maker of all in order to be spent on sacrificial pious works”; and the *Gītā*¹ and the other scriptures tell us that all works for the public good are ‘sacrifices’.

All such traditional ways have only to be deliberately systematised and regularised to make the Ancient Socialism again operative and effective for human happiness in India, and elsewhere also, for the fundamentals of human nature are the same everywhere, as Modern Socialism or Communism is not effective in Russia and Fascism is not in Italy.

One other important feature of the Ancient System should be prominently stated. The State-revenue, besides this surplus of the income of the ‘commercial professions,’ should be derived from one simple ‘income-tax,’ which should be a definite portion of the income of, or the raw material (particularly agricultural products) produced by, the members of the several vocational classes. In the old books, it varies from one-fourth¹ to one-fiftieth, for different occupations, kinds of trade, and ways of earning.²

The ancient Indian custom seems to have been for “the king’s share” to be paid mostly ‘in kind’ and not in cash, and “the king’s servants” were also paid for the large part in ‘kind’ and little in

¹ iii, 10; iv, 23-33.

² *Manu*, vii, 129-132.

cash. This system has many advantages, the chief ones being the automatic adjustment of rents, revenues, taxes, salaries, to times of scarcity and of prosperity ; the retention of sufficient necessities by the producers of food-stuffs and raw materials ; and the assurance of at least necessities, even in bad times, to non-producers also.' The evil effects of years of drought, flood, scarcity, famine, were thus minimised ; large stores of the surplus of good years were always available to meet the demands of bad years. Even now, the custom of payment of part of the salary in kind prevails in some Indian States and large landholders' families and even commoners' private homes, which are considered 'backward' and 'old-fashioned' from the new smart standpoint. The custom of *batāṛ* also, *i.e.*, 'sharing' of the produce, in kind, between landholder and tenant, is still followed in some parts of British India, as well as Indian India, which is now, generally speaking, in a worse condition than British India, because of the double government of the autocratic 'prince' and also of the British Political Department, in whose presence the 'prince' cowers as the reverse of 'autocratic' and whose smiles he endeavours to elicit in every possible way. But the pressure of the new laws, made to suit a capitalist bureaucratist régime, by which the fixed and heavy

¹ See Bhagavan Das, *Ancient Solutions of Modern Problems*, pp. 60-63, and *Manu*, vii, 115-120.

Government demand must be paid in *cash* by the land-holder, is breaking down the custom where it lingers, for it compels the landholder to realise rent from the tenant in cash, and the tenant to sell his produce in order to pay the fixed and heavy rent in cash. Even if the yield of his field be wholly marred by lack of rains, or over-abundance of them, or locusts, rats, or other insect-plagues, the fixed rent has to be paid by him. There are rules, framed by the Government, for suspensions or remissions of rent and revenue ; but the working of the rules depends wholly on the 'discretion' of the officials. The clever bureaucrats of the present régime in India show great concern, even tenderness, in words, for the starving agriculturist, on whose devitalised shoulders rests the whole vast and growing burden of the increasingly top-heavy Government ; and they discuss all kinds of schemes (all expensive, involving further multiplication of offices and office-hands, and thus ultimately adding to the burden of the peasant instead of reducing it) for improving his condition ; but they always carefully evade and avoid the very simple and very effective plan of collecting rents and revenues in *kind*, in a fixed proportion to the yield of the land ; for to do so would interfere at once with their convenience in drawing the very large salaries, fixed in terms of *cash*, which they are now drawing with the greatest ease, regularly, month by month, whatever may happen to the peasant,

whether he be fed and clothed, or go, as he does largely, empty-stomached and ragged.

In the new Russia, the ruling power, the dictatorship, has been changing repeatedly between taxes in kind and taxes in cash¹; but, either way, the *muzhik* is very unhappy, having to pay much more than he should, and having, consequently, to stint his family and himself in necessities; still he is much less unhappy than his brother of India, by all accounts. Lenin's ideal, of the whole country becoming "one office and one factory," requires, logically, that not only Communists and Proletarians should be paid and maintained by the State, but also *all the muzhiks also*; and that all the things produced by them all, *i.e.*, by all the three (or four) classes should belong to the State; that, in short, every individual should be a public servant or member of the family of one, and also a private citizen at the same time. But no such consideration is shown to the *muzhik* in Russia, though the work he does, the duty he discharges, of *food*-production, is obviously far more necessary for the very *existence* of the Society and the State, than the work of any other class; he is only a taxpayer and not a tax-payee; while the Communists

¹ M. Hindus, *The Great Offensive*, p. 111; Levine, *Stalin*, pp. 171, 297, 316; *Twelve Studies in Russia*, pp. 49-50. That the idea of barter, 'in kind,' even in very large-scale transactions, is not unpractical, is indicated by the reports, in the recent papers, that, (apparently because of the great shortage of coin due to the locking up of vast hoards of gold by U.S.A. and France) many countries are trying to rearrange their trade-relations by *exchange of goods direct*, in the way of barter.

and the proletarians are mostly tax-payees and scarcely tax-payers, generally speaking. Lenin's ideal is, no doubt, 'logically' correct. It is the 'Joint Family' ideal. The Whole People should become one vast Joint Family, prosily called by him "one Office and one Factory," in the terms natural and dear to the Machine Age. But Life is—only half 'logical'. Its other half is very 'illogical'. Individualised Life is *rooted* in Desire; and Desire is essentially the reverse of reason, it is un-reason-ing, arbitrary, irrational.¹ Hence, the universalistic, socialistic, all-one, all-I, feeling of the Joint Family cannot be extended and expanded beyond certain limits in act-uality; the individualistic, separatist, one-and-another, I-and-you, feeling also wants its share, its part in the World-Play, its place in the sun. What is logically symmetrical, becomes psychologically unpractical, therefore. Hence a compromise becomes necessary. It is provided by the Scheme of Four 'Joint Families' side by side, four Guilds, each with its own numerous sub-divisional joint-families, subordinate sectional guilds, all under the supervision of the Arch-Patriarch, the Brahmā of the *Yajña*, the Central Legislature of Spiritual Elders.

Such members of the first, second or fourth classes or guilds, as receive only comparatively small

¹ See Bhagavan Das, *The Science of the Emotions*, 3rd ed., p. 31; and the references in the Index, under 'Desire'.

honoraria, salaria, and wages, obviously need not be taxed, for taxing them would mean giving with one hand and taking back with the other. Their remunerations would be so fixed as to make it unnecessary to take taxes from them. But all incomes above a certain minimum, say a hundred rupees p.m., may be taxed. The tax would be mainly paid, in brief, by the third Guild, the wealth-makers-and-managers. This is but natural and right. Those who make wealth should keep the State Treasury replenished. It is understood that the third Guild would look after the production of all food-materials as well as all other raw materials, ensuring living wage to all workers, paying the State share, *i.e.*, paying all the public servants and services, and retaining profits for itself to the extent above-mentioned. A multiplicity of taxes—such as prevails now-a-days in most countries—is very undesirable. It means multiplication of tax-collectors, offices and office-hands, waste on unproductive middlemen, inquisitorial scrutiny of the private citizen's life, harassment of the public, and all the other evils of bureaucracy. So, graded surtaxes are also undesirable; for, as at present worked in Capitalist States, such as Britain and British India, they act only as stimulus to the capitalist to swindle more and more money out of the exploitable, and to the bureaucrat to help the capitalist in such swindling, so that his (*i.e.*, the States', which ultimately

means the bureaucrat's) share may be larger and larger. The Ancient Socialism suggests that rates of interest and proportions of profits to investments should be fixed also between lower and higher limits, and that trade in certain 'necessaries' should be so restricted and supervised, and prices of them so fixed, as to make 'cornering' and 'speculation' in them, to the distress of the general public, impossible. There is also the idea that each convenient-sized tract of country, with its urban and rural population, should be self-managing (by means of local panchāyaṭs, much the same as councils, boards, committees, or soviets) and self-sufficient in respect of all necessities, while trading in, and exchanging with others, articles of comfort and luxury. Finally, the Old Scheme makes it the duty of the Executive, the Ruler or, much better, the Protector, to find employment, through the several Guilds, for every person who has completed a course of appropriate education, every *snātaka*, in accordance with his vocational aptitude, as ascertained and certified by the Educational Guild, the *āchārya* or head of the *guru-kula*, the 'teacher's family-home,' the educational institution, where he has received instruction.¹

Such, in outline, is the idea of the inter-working of the Four Guilds, *chātur-varṇya*, as co-ordinated

¹ *Manu*, vii, 82-86 ; viii, 150-157.

and guided by a Supreme Legislature, *Dharma-parishaṭ*, *Majlis-i-qānūn*.

It should be noted that this idea is readily and naturally correlated with the ideas underlying and governing the *Outline Scheme of Swaraj* for India, published by the late Chittā-Ranjan Das (whom the Indian People spontaneously honored with the title of *Dēsha-bandhu*, 'the Friend of the Country') and the present writer, in 1923, by regarding the local 'Panchāyaṭs' (elective Councils, for groups of villages, for towns, for districts, and for provinces) as replicas on graded scales and as agents of the Supreme Legislature of the country, 'the All-India Panchāyaṭ,' performing the same functions as the latter, on smaller scales, and *mutatis mutandis*, in respect of the local operatives of the four Guilds.

The Central Legislature does not mean only a single small body of persons confined to one single spot, a single capital town. Like the nervous system, the central system of the human organism, with its principal seat in the skull and the spine, no doubt, but also ramified throughout the whole body, the Central Legislature should have its root and trunk in the principal city of the country, its main branches in the provincial capitals, its smaller branches and twigs in the other towns which may be the head-quarters of districts, and in the larger villages for village communes. It would be elected by a system of graded elections, direct in the first stage, indirect later; *i.e.*, it would start with direct

election for the village and town panchāyaṭs, where personal knowledge, by the electors, of the electee's *honesty* and uprightness of character, and maturity of *experience* and judgment would be certain. These village and town panchāyaṭs would elect the district panchāyaṭs; those, the provincial; those, finally, the supreme body. (Details may be seen in *The Outline Scheme of Swaraj for India.*)

That the 'State' should do everything, ploughing, sowing, reaping, cooking, washing, sweeping, sewing, building, mending, eating, mating, propagating, child-rearing, teaching, nursing, etc., for every person—the "One office and one factory" idea and "The State is all" idea—is one *reductio ad absurdum*; after all, the 'State' is not a super-human 'Entity,' with angel's wings or devil's horns and hooves and tail, and miraculous magical powers, but consists of human beings, and can do whatever it may do only by means of the hands and feet of human individuals. That every one should do everything for himself or herself, roads, rails, wires, ships, machinery of all kinds, parks, museums, theatres, zoos, art-galleries, universities, etc., is another *reductio ad absurdum* patently. That cunning individuals should be allowed every chance of exploiting and enslaving the less cunning masses at will, is a third, but much less patently. The best middle course, between all such extremes, it is suggested here, is the one embodied in the System of Four Guilds—individuals grouped into

families, millions of families grouped into Four Great Joint Families (with convenient occupational subdivisions, as needed), these into the greater Joint Families of Single States or Peoples, and all Peoples joined together in the One Great Joint Family or Universal Brotherhood of the Human Race presided over by a Super-Patriarchal Spirituo-Material League of All Religions and All Nations.

What are known as the 'ministrant' or 'positive' functions of the State, those 'promotive of the general welfare,' and the 'constituent' or 'negative' functions, those 'preventive of lawlessness and disorder' and preservative of 'law and order'—these functions would be partitioned between the four Guilds.¹ The 'law and order' or 'Protection' function, *rakshā*, *hifāẓat*, would be discharged by the second, the Guild of the Executive Professions, with its branch Guilds of the Militia, the Military, the Police, the Magistracy, etc. The 'general welfare' functions, all classifiable under 'education,' 'nutrition,' 'manual assistance,' *shikshā*, *jīvikā*, *sēvā*, or *ṭā'lim*, *rozgār*, *kḥiḍmat*—the due discharge of which reduces the work of the second Guild greatly—would be performed by the other three. The Guild of the Learned Professions, with its branch Guilds, of Educators and Spiritual Ministers, Scientific Researchers, Physicians and Surgeons, Lawyers, Engineers and Architects, Litterateurs, Artists, etc., would see to the

¹ See p. 82, *supra*.

provision of all the needed mental, moral, physical, vocational education, of all requirements of health and sanitation, of cultural recreation, adjudication, buildings and architecture, etc. The Guild of the Wealth Professions, with its branch Guilds of Farmers, Bankers, Merchants of different kinds of goods, Factory-owners, Managers of Transport and Communication by Air, by Sea, by Land, etc., would see to the adequate production and distribution of necessities, comforts, luxuries. The fourth, the Guild of Labor, with its branch Guilds, of Farm-workers, Mill-workers, Miners, Domestic-workers, etc., would see to the proper supply of all the labor needed for the work of all the Guilds. Despite enormous changes in the life of the Indian People, a close observer will still find many active remnants among them, all over the country, of a Guild-system, working under the names of *birāḍarī-panchāyats*, or 'sub-caste groups,' each with its local *chaudhrī* or headman. The castes and sub-castes, were only occupational guilds and sub-guilds in origin; gradually they have degenerated into rigidly hereditary groups which have largely lost their occupational character and are characterised now merely by mutual exclusiveness in dining and marriage.

The Guilds of every country would naturally collaborate with corresponding Guilds of other countries; and a World-Federation, in respect of the various natural departments of Human Life,

would grow into being inevitably under modern conditions of world-wide communication, on a more natural and therefore stronger foundation than that of the present League of Nations.

As all the adult members of all the Guilds would be entrusted with 'public' work and 'responsibility' of one kind or another, simultaneously with their bread-winning work, and the education of the young would be individual-socialistic from the very beginning, the idea of universal mutual inter-dependence being constantly kept before all minds, the interest of every one would be enlisted in general 'social' welfare; and, thus, socialistic as well as individualistic motives and incentives would be combined and balanced in each mind.

In the Central Legislature, a Party-system would not be needed, even in the sense of an alertly critical formal 'Opposition,' as against the 'Government'; and much less in the sense of Parties with antagonistic interests. What are now regarded as antagonistic and even irreconcilable interests, would have been reconciled by the whole structure of the Guild-Society, there would be complete agreement among all sections of the People or the Nation as to the fundamental institutions of Society, and endless 'opposition' would be replaced by earnest discussion of and heart-to-heart consultation over the inevitable two sides of every question, and a fairly unanimous

conclusion as to which course was productive of the lesser evil and the greater good in the given time, place, and circumstance.

Of course, with the very best of systems, all evil and all sorrow could not be abolished. Nature, God's Nature, Nature's God, have not succeeded in creating and carrying on the World-process in terms of only Good and only Joy. Man cannot hope to abolish evil and sorrow wholly. But they can be reduced in any given time and place by righteous human effort. Some of what are regarded by a section of men as the 'glories' of the modern capitalistic civilisation, maintained at the cost of enormous human suffering, would probably be diminished by the arrangements of Guild Socialism; but the great gains, in widespread human well-being, would make it well worth while to fling them away gladly.¹

The need of elders, of men and women of Wisdom, to form the Supreme Legislatures of the Nations and supervise and authoritatively direct the Executives thereof, leads us to the consideration of the Third Object of the T. S.

The Third Object of the T. S.

III. The Third Object of the T. S. is : To investigate the unexplained laws of nature and the powers latent in man.

¹ See Appendix for Note on Modern Guild-Socialism.

III. Lastly, there is the Third Object which, if it could be duly pursued, would help powerfully in the vivifying of the Second and the realising of the First. It is concerned with the development of the super-physical subtler faculties, senses, powers of knowledge and action, latent in man. The dense is derived from the subtile, the subtile from Space; solids are formed out of liquids, liquids out of gases; Physics is rooted in Super-physics (*i.e.*, superior, subtler, physics), that in Metaphysics (Greek, *meta ta physica*, that which is beyond physics, the Spirit which is the opposite of Matter, transcends Matter); Matter depends on Mind, that on Spirit; the Real arises out of the Ideal, the Ideal out of the Spiritual; the Finite abides in the In-de-finite, that in the Infinite. So we may say that the practical physical activities of Universal Brotherhood would be greatly helped by the presence of, and the guidance given by, persons possessed of superphysical, or at least mental and moral, virtues beyond the common, and such persons would derive their exceptional virtues from realisation of the One Metaphysical Heart of all religions and of Universal Religion, *viz.*, the Universal Self immanent in all beings.

Self-Sacrifice

The *Gītā* tells us that the Creator evolved the world of living beings by means of, and together

with the principle of, *Yajña*, *i.e.*, his own *self-sacrifice*, and lovingly instructed His progeny that only by *their self-sacrifice* would they "go forth and multiply," only by their self-sacrifice would their progeny, in turn, live and grow. No great work can be performed, no great object achieved, without sacrifice. He who runs may read this. But if the sacrifice is tyrannical and cruel *other-sacrifice*, the work and the object are accursed and will result in misery; if it is voluntary *self-sacrifice*, then they are blessed and will bring happiness.

*Psychological Vices of Democracies and their
One Fatal Weakness*

Even the Communists, even the Fascists, have succeeded to the extent they have, if at all, in achieving any good for their respective countries, by the voluntary self-sacrifice, or at least self-abnegation, of large numbers of mostly young men and women, (there are said to be about one million registered Fascists out of a total population of about forty millions in Italy; the registered Communists number about three millions out of a total population of over one hundred and sixty in Russia); also, unfortunately—and this is the element of wrong and of danger in their schemes—of much violent *other-sacrifice*. It seems to be generally recognised that the *very great weakness* of both these 'isms' is their utter lack of

any means for making sure of a perpetual succession of Lenins, Stalins, Mussolinis, *i.e.*, of Dictators and Despots who will be sincerely and unfailingly *benevolent*, and not *malevolent*. Bhishma, discussing the virtues and vices of oligarchies, *gaṇa-rājya*, and republics, *saṅgha-rājya*, says that greed for power, jealousy, intolerance, vindictiveness, intrigue, general scramble for leadership, and consequent dissensions, are the weaknesses that lead to the break-up of these.¹ In the French Revolution, there was a great deal of guillotining of one another by fellow-revolutionists. In Russia, the latest and the greatest example, we see Trotsky, the co-maker, together with Lenin, of the new Russia, driven out of Russia by Stalin; and "seventy-five leaders, including . . . an ex-ambassador to France and one who was mentioned in Lenin's testament as one of the six most capable men in the party and others of equal achievement and rank, . . . and fifteen hundred secondary chieftains" were exiled, and several "ex-commissars and several thousand minor officials and party members found themselves behind bars, many of whom when in office had distinguished themselves by unwarranted cruelty, by arbitrary rule . . . They who had forged the ring of iron called the dictatorship of the proletariat found themselves entrapped, isolated, and maltreated by the officers of the government they had established

¹ *Mahā-bhārata*, Shānti-parva, ch. 107.

and bitterly derided by their cellmates and fellow exiles.”¹

This does *not* mean wholesale condemnation of the new Russia. It only points out a radical defect and an element of very great danger in the system. The Fascists have indulged in similar vengefulness and terrorism. The Imperialist Capitalist States, which are possessed of far more solid and unchangeable Bureaucracies, are so much the more cruelly ‘efficient’ exploiters and terrorisers of the ‘subject’-masses. The ‘fear’ and ‘hate’ that pervades the whole atmosphere in the capitalist countries, and much more in ‘dependencies’, is something awful and most depressing; and it is necessarily a mutual fear; it cannot be one-sided; if the governed and the pauperised live in perpetual fear of the governors and the exploiters, no less live the latter in fear of the former. If the fear of the one is the fear of the weak and the cowardly, that of the other is the fear of the bully, more cowardly at

¹ I. D. Levine, *Stalin*, ch. XII, ‘The Bloodless Guillotine,’ pp. 228-237. Incidentally, though both claim to be followers of Marx and Lenin, and therefore “*scientific* socialists,” yet, “in the memorable battle between Stalin and Trotsky, both leaders sought to annihilate each other by volleys of quotations from these men” (M. Hindus, *The Great Offensive*, p. 175), which shows that *science* too is amenable to contradictory interpretations! The papers for August, 1934, indicate that there is a move in Russia to coax back all exiles, by issue of amnesty, in view of chance of war with Japan; and that Russia’s cleverest foreign diplomat, M. Litvinoff, has been secretly interviewing M. Trotsky, the greatest military organiser of new Russia, who beat back six simultaneously invading armies on six different fronts in the early days of the Revolution, in his hiding-place in France, to induce him to return to the Motherland.

heart in reality, but strong. The bully is well-defined by a Hindī proverb as "one who is brave towards the weak and cowardly towards the strong". The Cheka and then the O. G. P. U. (recently reported to be abolished, but in reality only re-organised and given another name, because the former had become too hateful to the people), the C. I. D. in India, and corresponding secret services in other countries, or the elaborate precautions taken everywhere for guarding the lives of the higher officials and dignitaries, are all most eloquent and most depressing evidence of the unhappy relations subsisting between the two classes into which mankind have been divided by modern western civilisation, or, to be more precise, its phase of capitalism-imperialism-militarism. Per contra, the old Samskr̥t word *rājā* means, etymologically, 'he who protects and fosters the people'. Just a change of spirit from unselfishness to selfishness, and the whole of Mankind are transformed from the Wise and the Innocent into the Knaves and the Fools, the Protectors and the Protected into the Oppressors and the Oppressed, the Nourishers and the Nourished into the Exploiters and the Exploited, the Parental and the Filial into the Owners and the Slaves, and Love is everywhere replaced by Fear and Hate!

If, as is said by travellers, "there are two Russias," much more truly are there two Italies, and two Britains (the 'west end' and the 'east

end'), even two U. S. A.s, and, of course very much more so, two Indias, that of the luxuriating hill-capitals and the wealthy quarters of the provincial capitals and the cantonments, and that of the toiling, moiling, starving plains-villages and town-slums.

A few extracts will illustrate :

" . . . We have undergone some of the most contradictory shocks at Leningrad. In the same minute we have often passed from ardent sympathy to anger, from pity to disgust, from admiration to irony . . . We were taken back to Leningrad in Lincoln cars, where a luxurious dinner awaited us at the Palace Hotel. At the entrance we were met by a doorman gilded and laced like one of the Claridge's at Paris . . . The dining room is decorated with flowers as though for a great banquet. In the balcony an orchestra was playing . . . The band struck into the Volga Boatman, and lo, we were wafted into fairy land . . . Each course was served with exactly the same ceremony . . . I thought of the crowds lined up in the streets of Leningrad before the doors of the co-operatives, anxiously awaiting their pound of potatoes and twenty-four grams of bread, their daily ration—where it could be furnished by the co-operatives, and if one had a worker's permit . . . But then not everybody works in Russia. We had learned that already from Paul Marion's book—*Two Russias*. A chauffeur to-day, and a soldier yesterday, let a few words fall on this subject, that explained the slow

moving, hungry, melancholy, dissatisfied crowds which we saw every day in Leningrad when we walked through the streets lined with broken windows. It certainly spoiled our appetites . . . Beside me one of my companions remarked, 'I am beginning to understand this communism. Twenty thousand eat like this, and one hundred and fifty million stuff bricks' . . . " ¹ But we must not forget that things are worse in India governed by Capitalist Britain, and that even in London the faces of those who stand outside, savage with hunger, looking through the great plate-glass windows, and the faces of those who are seated inside, feeding luxuriously, in the palatial hotels, wear very different expressions.

An Indian visitor to Russia in January, 1933, Shri Nitya Narayan Bannerjee, describes his experiences of Leningrad and Moscow in his book, *Russia To-day*. He was less fortunate than the writer last quoted, in that he had direct personal experience of food-shortage. He observed a general poverty and saw even beggars. Of the food served to him in a palatial hotel at Leningrad, he says, "the black bread was rancid and I doubt whether dogs could relish it"; there was no butter with the bread, nor was any milk available. In Moscow, the hotel was even grander, but the food was no

¹ Maurice Constantin-Weyer, Laureate of the Prix Goncourt, Art.: "A Visit to Russia; Leningrad in 1934," in *Leader* (Allahabad) date 31-3-1934.

better and the prices exorbitant; "It is almost impossible for foreigners to buy anything extra in the hotel"; a single apple cost him ten shillings. But his description of the treatment given to prisoners is enthusiastically eulogistic. A Russian youth, cross-examined as to the class distinctions which were noticeable and were based on differential scales of wages, confessed: "We are not yet Communists but only Socialists. When we have Communism . . . in about fifteen, thirty, or fifty years—none can say when, but we must have it one day—then there will be no cash exchange, none will be paid in cash; every one must work, must give the community what he can, and he will get what he needs, neither more nor less." At present all sorts of private trade are allowed by law though subjected to special disabilities, disfranchisement, heavy taxation, etc., and are frowned upon by public (*i.e.*, communist and proletarian) opinion. As the revolutionary fervor abates, a reversion to the old time-honored fundamental social institutions, *ré* property, etc., seems likely, but, let us hope, *refined, improved, placed and worked on a higher moral level of mutualist rights-and-duties*, as in the Varṇ-Ashrama scheme.

Defenders of Bolshevism say now and then, in the spirit of the Russian youth who said they were only socialists yet and hoped they would be Communists later on, that Communism (or Scientific Socialism) should be judged, as a perfect *theory*, by

the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and other recognised exponents. The obvious reply is that none can hope to be better students of those theorists than Stalin and Trotsky, and they have differed violently in interpretation and application. Also, as the wise proverb says, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Trees are judged by their fruits; men by their deeds; and theories can be judged best only by their results in practice. So far, the practice of Bolshevism shows that, professing the acme of Socialism, *i.e.*, Communism, it has achieved the acme of Individualism, *i.e.*, Dictatorship; proclaiming the abolition of Capitalism, it has established the very culmination of it in State-Capitalism; claiming to annihilate class-distinctions, it has exalted the Proletarian far above the *Muzhik*, and the Communist above the Proletarian; and talking of and hoping for the 'withering away' of the State, it has created a very climax of Bureaucracy. The redeeming feature is that the Dictatorship, the State-Capitalism, the Bureaucracy are, at least apparently, more benevolent on the whole, so far, to the masses, than they are in the Capitalist countries. The very perturbing feature is—that this well-intentioned-ness hangs by a hair, has no stability, no guarantee. On the other hand, we see that the super-capitalist countries, Britain and U.S.A., by the very conditions of the industries which have nourished Capitalism and commercialist-imperialist-militarist malevolence so far, have

produced, by reaction, as relieving feature, powerful Labor-organisations, pledged to Socialism of milder or severer form, which are advancing steadily and securing recognition for their rights more and more clearly, on the whole. Yet again, a Fascist movement seems now to be slowly gaining strength in Britain, with its despotically authoritarian and bureaucratic implications and claims. Also, particularly in a 'dependency' like India, while outwardly abusing Bolshevism, the Bureaucracy seems to be trying, in carefully word-disguised and camouflaged ways, to copy the Russian Dictatorship by getting all the Money-power of the country in its hands, by means of Government-controlled Reserve-Bank, etc.; the Knowledge-power is already largely under its thumb, through the official and semi-official universities, colleges, schools; the Military-and-Police-Power is its very heart obviously; and the Labor-Power is equally obviously under its heel. Yet, again, side by side with this, a definite movement for Self-government has also been gaining strength in India, steadily on the whole, despite repeated set-backs.

Thus are opposites arising out of one another always, and extremes meeting, in the Nature of the World-process. The Varn-Āshrama Dharma, the Scheme, the Code, of Socio-Individual Life, which is the middle course between the extremes of Individualism and Socialism, of Capitalism

and Communism, and reconciles harmonises, and synthesises both by giving each its due, seems to be the most stable way of securing the most equitable distribution of wealth, *i.e.*, of necessities, comforts, and luxuries, and the most widely spread general well-being.

The problem of problems always is: What is the cure for the great danger of change from benevolence to malevolence? How ensure an unfailing succession of *bene-volent* as well as *talented* Rulers, Chief and subordinate Executives?

*The Only Cure—A Class of Missionaries of God
and Ministers of Man*

The only means seems to be to create a permanent 'class' of persons, from whom primarily good and wise legislators and secondarily trustworthy rulers could be drawn, and who would have sufficient honored recognition amidst and influence over the general public to be *able to check effectively* the aberrations of persons in official authority. A prominent Indian Socialist, who is an energetic advocate of the 'classless' society, and who does not know Samskr̥t, when questioned closely on the subject, confessed to the present writer, in these very words: "The creation of a class embodying what you describe as the Brāhmaṇa ideal, seems to be the only remedy," obviously Brāhmaṇa by *worth* and by way of living, and *not* by birth.

Manu founds his Technique of Social Organisation, and builds the whole superstructure thereof, expressly upon such a class of Brāhmaṇas, "missionaries of Brahma" (by *karma* and not by *janma*). He tells how such a holy class is to be formed, recruited, maintained, and utilised by Society. H. P. Blavatsky was directed by her Master, "Tell them (the theosophists) to look into their *Manu*". Theosophists have the opportunity, nay the duty, in connection with the Third Object, to try to create a class of such genuine Brāhmaṇas, Maulavis, Rabbis, Divines, "men and women of God, Deus, Divus, Rabb, Maulā, Brahma, the Universal Self," persons full of *ṭapasyā*, *zohq*, asceticism, as well as *vidyā*, *irfān*, wisdom, special knowledge of the sciences of this world as well as those of other worlds, of physical as well as super-physical mysteries, co-ordinated by metaphysics. The presence of even a few such ascetic prophets, saintly sages, in the outer world, would have an extraordinary effect in uplifting the level of character of the general public, that presence itself being made possible by the rising of the level of character of the theosophists.

But be it noted that possession of any practical superphysical knowledge and power is by no means necessary, for our purpose. Spiritual-mindedness, however, and purity of character, self-denial, philanthropy, and knowledge and experience, are. If the system of Āshramas is

revived properly, and persons begin to retire, as a rule, soon after completing their fiftieth year, from the life of "the household" and competitive bread-winning, among any people, then that people will automatically begin to have a sufficient number of persons in the third stage of life, *vana-sṭha*, who would be sages worthy of all trust and reverence, fitted to make good laws, and able to guide and control the Executive by their moral force and influence.

In ancient Indian history, it was one of the functions of the holy Rṣhis, to go round periodically, inspecting State-administrations and cross-examining rulers on their conduct, and to punish incorrigibly vicious rulers and replace them by good ones. Medieval European history also shows that a genuinely Christian priest, bishop, archbishop, has often checked the wicked, baron, king, or emperor. If the educationist-scientist-priest-legislator realised, and rose to the height, of his duty of philanthropic self-sacrifice, of public denunciation and determined opposition of all wrongful oppression and of insistent proclamation of the right ways of planning and conducting all the departments of the national life, the ruler-official would not dare to misbehave, and would feel compelled to help in carrying out those plans. The men and women, all over the world, who are devoted to the worship of the Divinity of Wisdom, Science, Learning, and are engaged in that nobles

of all vocations, the vocation of teaching, of implanting right knowledge and developing righteous character and building up strong body in the younger generation, have only to add to their achievement and their work, their *vidyā*, their *ilm*, the virtue of *tapasyā*, *zohd*, resolute public spirit and philanthropy, and the holiness of asceticism and its inseparable will-power, its moral force, its spiritual all-subduing energy. As soon as they do so, the disease of the world would be cured—in a single day; the devils of greed, pride, lust, vice, would all be exorcised at once, and would take flight in fear and trembling from the hearts of the rulers, who would then become true public servants; the human world's atmosphere would be disinfected of the foul odours of Hate and become suffused with the sweet fragrance of Love, and Mankind be retransformed from "Oppressors and Oppressed" into "Protectors and Protected".¹

Wanted—A Real School of Yoga

H. P. Blavatsky mentions some of the Schools of Occultism that existed in ancient times.² She tried to create one herself, in the shape of the E. S. T. (first known as the Esoteric Section of Theosophy and then as the Eastern School of the T. S.). She passed away much too soon. The E. S. T. has not been a success, so far as the

¹ *Manu*, viii, 27-42; ix, 320; *Shukra-nīti*, ii, 79-82.

² *Isis Unveiled*, I, 482 and other places.

general public is aware. Systematic and strenuous efforts should be made to give it reality; and reality, be it remembered, in this case means helpfulness to the public, in the theosophical sense, as repeatedly said in *The Mahāṭmā Letters*. In one such, first circulated in the E. S. T., and, later, published in an early number of the *Lucifer*, it is said: "Theosophy should not represent merely a collection of moral verities, a bundle of metaphysical ethics, epitomised in theoretical dissertations. *Theosophy must be made practical*; and it has, therefore, to be disencumbered of useless digressions, in the sense of desultory orations and fine talk. Let every theosophist only do his duty, that which he can and ought to do, and very soon the sum of human misery, within and around the areas of every branch of your Society, will be found visibly diminished. Forget self in working for others—and the task will become an easy and light one for you."

Persons who have the needed ethical, intellectual, psychical, superphysical qualifications, who are real practical yogis along any of the recognised lines of the 'right-hand' path, should be sought for and invited to Lodges of the T. S. or the E. S., on their own conditions, as far as possible, to act as guides to others; moral, mental, and physical qualifications and tests may be prescribed for those who seek guidance and are prepared to run risks; one of the qualifications may perhaps be freedom from family ties or at least dependents; scientific

methods should be adopted for demonstration and experiment; faith should not be asked for if proof cannot be given. If such a school of occult studies succeeds in producing the right quality of *alumni*, missionaries of the Supreme Spirit in heart and mind, even though they may not have succeeded in developing any definite superphysical faculties (though a certain amount of psychic sensitiveness is almost certain to accrue if the conditions of *yoga* or *sulūk*, viz., *ṭasfīyah-i-dīl*, or *yama*, *niyama*, etc., are observed), then indeed the world would be set on the right path of peace, progress, prosperity, material and spiritual happiness, by their moral and spiritual influence and their active labors for the good of mankind.

Under their guidance, mankind would be provided with pure food, pure drink, pure air, for the physical body, in sufficiency for all, and with righteous thought, righteous emotion, righteous volition, for the nourishment and play of the mental body, in abundance for all; and many of the very artificial sciences, often built up on the cruel suffering of living beings, which are adding enormously to human misery by their misuse, which are lending now a tinsel shine and now a lurid glare to modern civilisation, would become 'dead learning,' as the so-called science of (capitalist) economics has become in the new Russia.¹

¹ *Twelve Studies in Russia*, p. 140.

Difficult—Yes. Even Utopian. But was the T.S. founded to promote habits of ease? *The Mahātmā Letters* describe the Masters as “slaves of duty” and mention instances of the terrible toil undergone by them from time to time, or indeed incessantly. Is not everything worth having difficult, utopian? Was not the Russian Revolution more difficult and more utopian, even down to the middle of 1917? Or the Italian Fascist Revolution down to 1922? Or flying in the air, down to 1908? It is not more difficult than maintaining thirty million Misemployed, for purposes of war, and thirty million (or including Asia probably a hundred million) Unemployed on doles, (or without public doles, and by private charities, in Asia). It is not more difficult than the semi-starvation and worse oppressions which vast masses of men, women, children, suffer day after day, month after month, year after year. It is not more difficult than even the labors which physical scientists undergo voluntarily and gladly to achieve their misused discoveries and inventions. It is very, very, much less ‘difficult’ than to bear the horrors of the Armageddon that is sure to come otherwise. Where there is a will there is a way.

*Help Them Who are Holding Back the
Forces of Darkness*

At the heart of any and every Scheme of State-Constitution, any Scheme for the Administration

of Human Affairs, whether it be framed in terms of *rājya* or *shāhī*, 'archy' or 'cracy', 'ship' or 'ism,' or 'ment' or 'tion,' whether it be 'scientific' or 'utopian,' there is to be found inevitably the Crux of all Political Science and Art, *viz.*, "How make sure of good and wise laws, how make sure of good and wise legislators to make such laws, how make sure of able, upright, self-sacrificing, public-spirited officers, 'public servants' in the real sense of the expression, persons who regard themselves as *servants* of the public and not as their *masters*—how make sure of such to execute and enforce those laws righteously?"

The Ancient 'Scientific' Socialism of Manu, at the very end (in ch. xii) of his Book of Laws, accordingly, says: "The Final Secret of this whole Science of Man, of Human Rights-and-Duties, of the Regulation of all Human Life and Affairs, is this—When new situations appear, for which suitable laws do not exist already, and the question arises, what should be done in these new circumstances, then what the *men of wisdom* declare should be the law, that shall be the law; and the men of wisdom are they who *know* Human Nature and its requirements, can observe facts accurately, draw conclusions and foresee consequences far-sightedly, *know* the various sciences and history and traditions closely, and, above all, are full of self-denying *philanthropy*."

Elsewhere, earlier, (in ch. vii), the Book says that the administrator, the executor, the ruler, shall be the 'man of action' (in distinction from the 'man of knowledge'), shall be 'consecrated' with the best spiritual-temporal education appropriate for his functions, shall be of self-denying and chivalrous temperament, free from lust, greed, pride and all vice, and ever eager to *protect*, to *defend*, the laws and the people, from all injurious attack, at the cost of even his life. It is also laid down, in the last chapter, that if this person, the Chief or subordinate Executive of the State, appointed to his duty by the men of wisdom, should prove unworthy, and yield to temptation and vice, and begin to misuse the sacred *danda*, the sceptre, the 'rod of power,' the compulsive force entrusted to him for the protection of the People, then it becomes the duty of the 'men of wisdom' to correct him, punish him, by all appropriate means, superphysical or physical, or remove him and replace him by a worthy person; for the 'man of wisdom' is greater than the 'man of action,' gives birth to him, evolves him out of himself, appoints him, creates for and entrusts to him the means, the machinery, the instruments, the weapons, of defence of the People, and he can also therefore dismiss and dissolve him and take back what he has given. In the last resort, the law-making power includes the law-enforcing power, though, in the daily practice, the two have to be kept apart.

In short, the success of any Scheme that sincerely seeks the Welfare of Mankind, the Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number, ultimately depends upon the presence of a sufficient number of 'Holy' men and women among the People, persons who have realised their Oneness with the 'Whole' (from which word, 'holy' and 'heal-th' are derived, cf. Skt. *bahula*, *bhūmā*, vast, all-comprehending, greatest, Infinite), and are therefore no longer self-seekers, seekers of the pleasures of their 'individual' small selves, but have become servants of the Whole, the 'social' Universal Self.

Even in the most elaborately and scientifically designed Utopia, laws, rules, methods, and enforcement of them, by impulsion from within, or compulsion from without, must be necessary. The supposition of a People, of which the component individuals are all equally wise and equally good, all always and equally inspired from within themselves to the highest righteousness, so that scarcely any laws and no enforcement of them from without by others are needed—such assumption is almost forbidden (except in rare special conditions, temporarily) by the Metaphysical Law of Polarity or Duality which is the mainspring of the whole World-Process. Good and Evil are twins. Satan is born in the highest heaven together with the Christ. Devas and *ḍāityas*, gods and titans, angels and devils, *farisṭas* and jinns, are step-brothers, both present even in *Saṭya-yuga*, the Golden Age,

the Morning of Creation. Each soul has to pass through both kinds of experience—of selfishness, and also of self-sacrifice. But what is not forbidden by Metaphysics, what, on the contrary, is asserted by it, is that, in given times and places, *Good can prevail greatly* over Evil, as, unhappily, the reverse would be the case in other times and places. And Metaphysical Ethics enjoins that it is the bounden duty of such of us as have arrived at the stage, in cyclic evolution, where we can consciously distinguish between Good and Evil, Selfishness and Selflessness, to strive with all our might to make the Good prevail over the Evil, 'regardless of fruit,' not caring whether we succeed immediately or not. To propose is ours, to oppose Evil is ours, to try to compose Good is ours, to dispose finally is the Supreme Dramatist's.

And the only chance of our 'proposal' succeeding, is in the evolving in our midst, and the careful fostering and maintaining there, of a sufficient number of 'holy' men and women, in the third Āshrama or stage of life (though the development of superphysical faculties, possible only in rare cases yet, has the best chance only if training is begun in childhood), to be the Educators and the Legislators of the People. Supply follows demand, in Superphysics as in Economics. A shallow-minded, sense-seeking, unprincipled People will evolve leaders of the same quality, who, in turn, by action and

reaction, will lead them ever more and more rapidly towards the Inferno of world-starvation, world-prostitution, world-destruction by internecine wars. But if a People wants, wills, prays, with all its heart that such souls should be born in its home, such leaders arise in its midst, as will guide it to happiness, create for it the kingdom of heaven on earth by wise legislation and righteous administration; if the People gives honor, gives reverence, only to the worthy; then souls, then leaders, of the right temperament will be born among that People, will arise and respond to such enlightened and spiritualised Public Opinion and Public Wishing, and will make themselves more and more worthy of trust and reverence, and will, in turn, by action and reaction, improve the quality of the People, and enable them to march forward, ever more and more steadily and rapidly to that Heaven on Earth. In such a State will all 'isms' and all 'cracies' be reconciled and harmonised. 'Democracy' will have its fullest due in the free choice by the Demos of the *Ariston*, the *best and wisest man*, for the function of law-maker, the real *Focus* of Sovereignty; and the supposed opposite of 'Democracy,' *viz.*, 'Aristocracy' will have its full due also, through the 'Ariston' being gladly *recognised* by the 'Demos,' the People, as possessed of the divine right of *worth*, and therefore chosen freely, nay, eagerly, to be such Focus, by the People who

are the ultimate *Locus* of all Sovereignty. In this way, by distinction of ever inseparable Focus and Locus would be reconciled all the various theories, monistic, pluralistic, atomistic, etc., as to the seat of Sovereignty.

“Awake ; arise ; evolve, find, choose, the good, the wise, the holy ones ; and follow their advice . . . Helping one another, ye shall all attain to the Highest Good.”¹

Conclusion

I have ventured to make these suggestions, possibly foolish, possibly useful, certainly well-meant, and in all humility, for the future work of the T. S., with intimate reference to the burning problems of the time, and put them before the theosophical public and the general public, for whatever they may be worth, because world-conditions are such to-day that there is no individual and no group but is touched in one way or another by those problems, and has to do something, to the best of his or its judgment, towards their solution.

May the One Light illumine our minds and enable us to see clearly the Path of Truth and

¹ उत्तिष्ठत, जाग्रत, प्राप्य वरान् निबोधत ।

परस्परं भावयंतः श्रेयः परम् अवाप्स्यथ ॥

Love and Righteousness! May the One Power
give us the strength of will to tread that Path
aright! May the One Life bind our hearts
together and lead us all to Happiness and Peace!

ॐ

सर्वस्तरतु दुर्गाणि सर्वो भद्राणि पश्यतु ।
सर्वः सद्बुद्धिमाप्नोतु सर्वः सर्वत्र नन्दतु ॥

ॐ

APPENDIX

THE Vedic Code of Individuo-Social Life, Scheme of Social Organisation, or Four-Guild Socialism as we may now call it, the Permanent Planning of each Individual Life into Four Stages or Āshramas and of the Collective Social Life into Four main broad Vocations, Occupations, Functions, or Varnas, was intended to be at once (1) a mould into which could be poured, and thereby Aryanised and civilised, the thousands of tribes of Man, of all countries, as they came gradually into contact with the original Aryans, and into which the hundreds of tribes of India were actually so poured during the Vedic and even the Buddhist period, and (2) a device, based on the fundamental facts and laws of psychological science, by which could be solved all the problems of human life, educational, domestic, economic, industrial, political, recreational, æsthetic, artistic, religious and any others that there might be, as they arose in changing forms, from time to time.

But this profound significance and purpose of that Scheme has been so completely lost from the thought and the practice of its custodians, for fifteen centuries more or less, that if any one now suggests that it has such deep meaning and value, he only calls up a smile of good-humored pity, or of ridicule, or even a frown of impatient annoyance, on the face of the heterodox

listener steeped in current western thought, or a blank stare of incredulity and non-comprehension on the face of the orthodox person who has lost all touch with the still not wholly dead heart of the ancient, on the one hand, and, on the other, has not contacted in thought the living head of the modern.

Yet if the light of the western discussions of the various 'isms,' of Socialism of many varieties, State or Collectivist or Bolshevik, or Communist, or Anarchist, or Guild, and of Liberalism, Conservatism, Fascism, Authoritarianism, Totalitarianism, Imperialism, Militarism, Capitalism, Mercantilism, Commercialism, Economic Nationalism, etc., is turned upon it, it stands out as a system to which the modern name of Guild Socialism seems most nearly applicable.

To further elucidate the case and re-inforce the arguments for this Ancient Scientific Guild Socialism, outlined in the text in comparison and contrast with the other main current 'isms,' it seems desirable to append some extracts from recent literature on modern western ideas and schemes of Guild-Socialism. For this purpose, three writings have been selected here: (1) The article on 'Guild-Socialism' in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 14th edition (1929), and *Guide through World-Chaos*, pp. 588-593 (1933), both by G. D. H. Cole, who has written a number of separate books also on the subject, (2) the brilliant and powerful little book, *The Guild-State* (1919), by G. R. S. Taylor, which was largely quoted from by Annie Besant in her pamphlet, *The Guild-System as a substitute for Trade-Unionism* (1921), and (3) the eminently lucid, comprehensive, yet very concise book, *Roads to Freedom* (3rd edition, 1920), by Bertrand Russell, which, when it first appeared,

won encomiums from reviewers of the most diverse schools of thought, as a 'clear,' 'calm,' 'sober,' 'accurate,' 'balanced,' yet also 'eloquent,' 'admirable,' and 'extraordinarily interesting,' presentation of "the four main theories which at present are being urged as cures for the unhappiness of the world," *viz.*, (State) Socialism, (philosophical) Anarchism, Syndicalism, and Guild-Socialism.

These extracts, interspersed with occasional comments, will show the resemblances as well as the differences between the ancient and the modern views of Guild-Socialism, and suggest how the Ancient Scheme tries to incorporate the good points, avoiding the extremes, of most of the 'isms' that are engaged in conflict to-day, and to sublimate harmful propensities of certain types of men by putting them to beneficial uses. It is hoped that these extracts may induce the reader to peruse the originals in full.

I. Art.: "Guild-Socialism," in Encyclopedia Britannica; and Guide through World Chaos, (pp. 588-593) by G. D. H. Cole.

"Guild Socialism is the name of a school of Socialist thought which became prominent in Great Britain in the second decade of the twentieth century, and spread thence to other parts of the world . . . Its governing idea is that of *self-government in industry*—the application of democratic principles to industrial as well as to political affairs—and the *organisation* of the economic life of the community on a *functional* basis . . . It is based on an attempt, in some measure, to apply medieval ideas to modern problems. This does not mean (any

wish) to restore the medieval guild system or . . . to revive handicraft in place of machine production ”.

That the wholesale substitution of machinery for all handicraft is not an unalloyed blessing, that some amount of ‘cottage’-industry is necessary to foster, for many reasons, is being shown by recent discussions on the subject, by the conditions in countries like France and Czecho-Slovakia, and by the experiments in some of the highly mechanised countries for the revival of handicraft, to say nothing of India, where the home spinning-wheel seems to be a necessary of life, at least for the village-population.

“ Guild-Socialism was presented more and more as a reconciliation of Syndicalist and Socialist doctrines. Like the Syndicalists, it *denounced bureaucracy and State-control*. Unlike them, it repudiated An-archism, and recognised the necessity of the State as an instrument of political organisation and control . . . It involves the ownership of industries by the whole community as well as their administration by ‘the workers by hand and brain ’—a phrase originally coined by the Guild-Socialists—engaged in them . . . Guild-Socialists differ, indeed, in their views about the form and structure of the State in a Guild Society. Some believe in the continued supremacy of the State as the political organ of government, while others hold that the State in its present form is destined to disappear, and to be replaced by a sort of *federal authority representing the community in its various functional aspects*. This latter view, which has usually carried the day, is closely associated with the philosophical ideas of political Pluralism . . . Industrial self-government is, for the Guild Socialists, the application to Economics of

a *general principle* that is of far wider significance. They believe that *democracy* can be real only if it is *functional*, that is, if it is *specifically related to each of the main activities of Society* . . . The conditions of a *man's daily work* will inevitably affect *his attitude and status* as a citizen . . . The *existing economic system* fails because it *does not call out what is best in men*."

Indeed, it would not be too much to say that it calls out the worst. In every department of life, the shamelessly brazenly professed and proclaimed money-motive has swamped the beneficent spiritual motive which ought obviously to prevail at least in such aspects of life as those of education, religion, medicine, law, and just dealing with and ample supply of all necessities to workmen in the department of wealth-production and distribution.

"Instead of a co-operative fellowship of service we have contending groups of masters and men, alike wasted by 'the sickness of an acquisitive Society'. It is necessary so to *organise the economic and social system* as to make each service a responsible *fellowship*,¹ whose members are 'on their honor' to do their best in the interest of all . . . As a distinct body of doctrine, Guild-Socialism reached its highest point in the years immediately after the War. Thereafter, it gradually dissolved . . . But *its influence survives*, and *many* of its once hotly contested *doctrines* are now *generally accepted* among Socialists in Great Britain . . . The Guild Socialists' insistence that the *power* which goes with *responsibility* must be *diffused* to the widest possible extent *among* the whole mass of the *people*, and that

¹ Compare the Indian word *birādarī*, 'brotherhood,' for 'subcaste panchāyats'.

this diffusion, *on functional lines*, is the necessary condition of democratic health in the body politic, is now part of the common stock of Socialist doctrine." (*Encyclopedia Britannica*.)

"The Guild Socialist Movement . . . taught the Socialists to *mistrust* plans for bringing the operation of Socialised industries under the direct administration of the State, or for *conducting* these *industries by bureaucratic methods*. The ideal in the minds of socialists came more and more to be that of providing for the fullest possible *control* by the *community as a whole* over industrial *planning* and policy in matters of general concern, while *leaving the detailed conduct of industry* as far as possible in the hands of *functional corporations*¹ of one sort or another . . . Each industry or service would presumably be organised as a largely autonomous corporation looking after its own internal affairs—a body corresponding to the 'combination' as it exists in Russia to day—and in the larger industries these corporations would certainly be broken up into smaller largely autonomous sections, sometimes for a particular area and sometimes for a particular branch of production. These smaller groups would correspond to the Russian 'trusts' which are members of the various 'combinations' . . . Finally, Socialists envisage as the supreme co-ordinating body for the socialised industrial enterprises some sort of National Development Commission, acting on the advice of a national planning authority, much as 'Gosplan' in Russia is related to the Council of Labor and Defence . . . There has been in recent years . . . a movement to set up central economic

¹ Compare the Indian word *birāḍari*, 'brotherhood,' for 'sub-caste panchāyaṭs'.

councils of one kind or another, and to confer upon these bodies advisory functions which are at least an adumbration of the idea of national industrial planning . . . These councils, however, have been given far too little authority to achieve any considerable results; and in most cases their personnel has not been such as to encourage the hope that they are likely to develop into satisfactory planning bodies. They have been constituted too little of experts and too much of representatives of conflicting industrial interests, and their members have been, for the most part, far more intent on preserving the structure of Capitalism and preventing the growth of Socialist enterprise than on developing any coherent national plan." (*Guide through World Chaos*, pp. 588-593.)

II. *The Guild-State*, by G. R. S. Taylor

"There is a fantastic rumour, circulating in the main among historical dons and in political clubs, that progress is the discovery of something new; whereas, in truth, it is far more often the return to something old" (p. 1) —on a higher level, we may add. "Instead of electing delegates to make laws at Westminster, the people of the middle ages were their own legislators at home. It may sound very rural; but we have failed to grasp the fact that it is really far better to be so safe in our freedom that we do not need to be protected by representatives at all." (p. 14.)

How legislation is being fatuously overdone is indicated by the fact that in the dozen years, from 1919 to 1930, according to a newspaper report, the British Parliament passed about seven hundred and fifty Acts

covering over eight thousand pages of print; and in the same period, the several States of the U. S. A. passed an aggregate of *sixty thousand* Acts! And the approved legal maxim is that 'Ignorance of the law is no excuse'! —except for the paid professional judge, who may say (as the present writer has actually read in the printed report of a High Court judgment), in excuse for a previous wrong judgment, 'My attention was not drawn to this provision of the law by the advocate concerned'! When legislators are paid, they naturally feel that to justify themselves they must turn out more and more laws, as machines must 'goods' (more often 'bads'), as armament-firms the means of life-destruction, or as lawyers and doctors and policemen, etc., their respective kinds of 'cases,' and schoolmasters their 'passes'; payment by results pays only in the wealth-making department of the national life, not in any other.

"The compelling force of the Middle Ages was not Law but Custom . . . Tradition is the everlasting memory of Mankind," (p. 15). "It is natural that in the medieval society of commonsense people, the guilds should take a supremely important part. In an age when government was both local and economic, instead of centralised and political, that is, when the town or village mainly ruled itself, and when its 'laws' were the rules of everyday business affairs, then the guild, being the collective assembly of the local wisdom and business experience, naturally took a foremost place in business life . . . slowly the central powers built up a governing hierarchy of their own; the sheriffs, the justices of the king's court, the lord-lieutenant of the counties, gradually sucked the power from the local assemblies and held

it in the hands of the Councils and officers of the Crown. When that was accomplished, the Middle Ages were no more; the Modern System had begun, . . . centralised, political, autocratic," (pp. 19-22). "Central government is the root of the modern system . . . The Modern idea is that the people should receive their instructions from above. It is assumed that the State can govern its subjects far better than they can govern themselves. The aim of the modern politician appears to be to increase by every means that central power . . . for controlling the lives of the people down below . . . Modern government must break down sooner or later, because it is growing so complex and so remote from the facts of the case . . . In these overstrained centres (the capital towns) we find a vast crowd of officials who have but a trivial knowledge of what they ought to do . . . while outside are the passive citizens who scarcely can discover what has been done. It is a tragedy of cross-purposes. It has become a superstition that this is the only way of governing, and that the only people who can do it are those politicians, with their bureaucrats and their financial 'advisers'—which seems the most discreet term for a somewhat delicately ambiguous relationship . . . The highest success of the modern system, as a piece of clever advertising, is the astounding statement that it is more democratic than the medieval system . . . This pretence of democracy is the greatest bluff of history." (pp. 26-29.)

The introductory chapter on 'The Historical Basis of the Guild System' ends with a vivid picture of the causes, *viz.*, over-centralisation and internal fights for power between Senate and Emperors which brought about the downfall of Rome. "Rome perished because

it became the strongest government in the world. It was crushed by barbarians who scarcely knew what government meant. But, in truth, it was not the Teutons who ruined Rome. It was ruined by its own governors—the bureaucrats; as the British Empire will be ruined . . . It is the learned persons who accept the present so innocently, who are parochial and short-sighted. It is the simple who seem to grasp the ever-lasting traditions of humanity. It is the university professors who are so often sentimentalists; it is often the peasants who know the truth.” (pp. 34-35.)

The next three chapters expound “the three main principles on which the Guild system stands” according to the author, *viz.*, (1) “The main basis of the *organisation of public life* should be a classification *by function or trade* . . . (2) The guilds must be self-managed . . . (3) The guilds must avoid the highly centralising tendency of modern society.” (p. 91.)

(a) *The first principle.* “The key to social structure under the guilds is *organisation on the basis of function*; the citizens will be organised in the groups of their trades or occupations; not primarily in their parishes or constituencies. To a great extent this organisation has already a large place in modern societies. Thus, the shareholders of a tea-plantation, . . . the cotton operatives organised as a trade-union, . . . the teachers of a university, . . . the doctors, . . . the lawyers, . . . are grouped by function . . . The system of organisation by function is deeply rooted in human society . . . The guildsmen claim that it is by far the *most vital link* in the social structure . . . His chief business is the central fact in the life of each citizen; and his relations with his fellowmen must be largely

determined by it' . . . The most *violent contrast* is that between the *area theory* of the politician and the *functional theory* of the guildsman . . . *Politicians elected by area* to do the work of the nation, very obviously do not do that work . . . or (do it) very badly . . . Half the *political adventurers in parliament* who fail to represent their constituents have really the very reasonable excuse that an archangel alone would suffice . . . How is it possible that the normal citizen could choose by the crude parliamentary system the right man for his purposes? . . . The parliamentary system might be all right if it could perform a first-class miracle—master *the knowledge of the world and translate it into legislation* . . . If any man has any exact knowledge at all, it is on the subject of his daily work . . . If the *nation were grouped into trades rather than geographical areas*, it would then be organised on the *main principles of interest and knowledge*.” (pp. 36-43.)

The miracle becomes easy and even sure, if only the far from difficult operation is performed, of electing to the Central Legislature, really worthy representatives of all the Four main Guilds, who would obviously possess, between them, the available “knowledge of the world” with respect to all the main departments of the people’s life. As it is, Nature compels western electorates, subconsciously, to send in representatives of all such departments or ‘interests’. Thus, in Britain, the House of Lords includes mostly the Clergy and the Nobility, broadly, though very defectively and very unworthily

¹ Cf. अर्थस्य पुरुषोदासः, नार्थो दासस्तु कस्यचित् ।

Mbh., Shāntiparva.

and योऽर्थे शुचिः सहि शुचिर्न मृद्वारि शुचिः शुचिः । *Manu.*

corresponding to and representing the 'Men of Knowledge' and the 'men of action'; and the House of Commons, mostly the 'men of business' and the 'men of labor,' again only broadly, very defectively, and very unworthily. But all the grace and virtue and benefit of such election of all four kinds are wholly lost, because the election is made in the spirit of enmity and rivalry and endless *conflict*, on stumps and at polling-booths, over 'interests' imagined to be and then (by mere excess and lack of due mutual proportion) actually *made, hostile* to each other, instead of being made in the spirit of sympathetic good-will and solicitously friendly co-operation, over 'interests' duly moderated and *known to be inter-dependent* in a universally accepted Scheme of Social Structure and its fundamental institutions.

The author goes on to describe the possibilities of efficient administration of their respective departments of the national labor, in the socialistic spirit, so as to be of the greatest possible use to the people as a whole, by Guilds of Coal-miners, Agriculturists, Teachers, Railwaymen, Doctors, Lawyers, Retail Shopkeepers, Cotton-workers, Iron-workers, Wool-workers, Ship-builders, etc. The word Guild "is used instead of 'company' or 'association' because . . . (the guild) is a group of *actual workers* . . . not simply shareholders who have merely invested money". (p. 44.) "The vast bulk of the work that is necessary for a nation's health can be produced under co-operative guilds as easily as under capitalist companies." (p. 49.) "There is no narrow dogmatism about the Guild-idea. It is not a despotism. It attempts no more than arranging the affairs of our daily work." (p. 54.)

(b) *The second principle.* "If organisation by function is the first principle and the anatomical structure of the Guild-system, the principle of *self-management* is the idea which makes the dry bones of that structure move with life . . . The soundest reason for self-management in a Guild is that it is clearly impossible to find a better way of doing the work. It is inconceivable that any State Department sitting at Whitehall should know as much about an industry as they know in the work-shops or the mines . . . The Guild-system is government by craftsmen; the centralised monarchy or plutocracy is government by machine." (pp. 58-64.)

"*The State will lay down general principles* which even self-managing guilds must respect. There will be probably a *minimum wage* . . . Beyond that each guild will be allowed to distribute its surplus as the members decide by a vote of the majority. It is *very improbable* that they will vote at first for *equality of wages*. There will be a fairly united refusal of the full-aged and experienced members to accept equality with the young apprentices . . . There is *no reason* to think that the Guilds will immediately *abolish competition*. It will be made a *sane competition* for the benefit of the community, instead of the very *insane* one for the benefit of the *profiteer* . . . And if competition between guilds remains, it will be to the advantage of the members to pay enticing *rewards* for the most experienced managers and officials . . . *within the standard laid down by the State in its first principles* . . . There may well be a State standard of hours of work . . . At what point State general principles will cease and the equally great State principle of self-management begin, cannot be decided by hard-

and-fast boundary lines . . . Only dull-witted persons demand inelastic rules . . . The general rule will be that all technical points concerning the processes of production will be under the control of the Guild . . . IT WILL BE FOR THE STATE TO EXPRESS WHAT IT WANTS; IT WILL BE FOR THE GUILD TO SAY HOW IT WILL BE DONE." (p. 67.) "It is difficult to exaggerate the technical advantage of giving *every worker*, humanly and legitimately, a *selfish interest in the welfare of his guild* . . . Deep down in the Guild idea is the conviction that there is something inherently vicious in all compulsory government, and that self-control is the key to many of the problems of human society." (pp. 70-72.)

(c) *The third principle.* "No guild should be larger than the smallest possible unit that the efficiency of the trade or occupation requires. This principle is the exact contrary of almost every orthodox theory in history or economics for the last hundred and fifty years. Ever since the Middle Ages there has been a tendency for all political and economic organisation to grow more and more centralised. The Middle Ages themselves were a reaction against the colossal centralisation of the Roman Empire . . . Centralisation has meant the triumph of the governor over the governed . . . (The system of centralisation) is so vast and complex that the most honest of officials or members of parliament do not know how to put right that which is wrong . . . The hopelessly *over-centralised government* of to-day has outstripped all reasons and become an *ever-increasing advantage to the corrupt and inefficient* and an *ever-decreasing good to the honest and efficient* . . . Unless a bureaucracy produces many rules, people might

think it was scarcely worth its wages; so it makes as many as it can, for the same reason that miners produce as many tons of coal as possible . . . The members of the guild should bear clearly in mind that . . . the *two primary characteristics* of a candidate for office must be *knowledge* and *honesty* . . . There is a rough-and-ready test of the electoral system: Can the *elector* have any really intimate *knowledge of the capacity and character* of the *candidate* he is selecting? If he cannot, then there is *little good* in worrying about the exact *method* of election . . . If we once decide that democracy is the necessary key note of modern civilisation, then the small electoral and *functional* area seems indispensable." (pp. 74-85.)

In his fifth chapter, the author discusses the special advantages of the Guild System, (a) Variety of Experiments, (b) Sane Competition, (c) Peaceful Transition and Gentle Changes, (d) Education of the Workers, (e) Democratic Distribution of Power and Wealth—"though there will be higher wages to those who do higher work, some will have to be content with *more fame* and rather *less fortune*," and (f) Healing of Social Wounds, when "the average worker gets better pay and more dignity"; (pp. 91-108.)

The sixth chapter deals with the "Relations between Guilds and State". "In the beginning the State will have to do much which later may be done by the Guild without external assistance . . . Once accept the Guild System and it follows that the *Central Government* is relieved of a vast bulk of its *functions*; it will *assign these to the Guilds as its agents*. Such affairs as Education and Public Health will be sorted out to the various Guilds of Education, of Doctors and Sanitary Engineers

etc. If the Teachers and the Doctors cannot give us good health and sound Education, bureaucrats and politicians can do it less . . . We will *leave everything to the State which the Guilds cannot conduct with greater skill* as professionals." (pp. 109-113.)

Thus the Army and the Navy and Diplomacy would be left to the State, according to the author, while war-mentality lasts. But, in the ancient Indian view, this residual State might well be regarded as the Guild of Protectors, *Kshat̥triyas*, *Mahāfiz*. Legislation would not be its work; only protection and enforcement of the law. Legislation would be done by the Central Legislature, the Dharma-Parishaṭ, the Majlis-i-Haq, the Council of Elders representative of and elected by all the Four Main Guilds, as suggested in the last chapter of the text. This Central Body would be the true residual State, in the ordinary sense of the word, *viz.*, the supreme authority. It would "express what it wants," in respect of education, medication, sanitation, recreation, protection, culture, adjudication, industrial assistance, production and distribution of necessities, comforts, luxuries, supply to all guilds of needed resources in materials and money; and the Guilds would supply the wants. In other words, it would do the Planning, to use the Soviet expression; and the respective Guilds would carry out the plans.

"It will be the continuous tendency of a well-educated society to withdraw power from the hands of the State, rather than to add thereto . . . The more civilised a man is, the less he requires instruction from policemen and government clerks . . . A *United Congress of the Guilds* might be the ultimate form taken by the *State* . . . However far the decentralisation may be

carried, there will always be something left over that will be better settled by the united State . . . so that, sooner or later, it will be necessary to face the problem of the structure of the *Central Organ of Government* . . . No system will be fool-proof or knave-proof." The best results would probably be obtained if "the members of the *Central Parliament* are elected on the basis of the *Guilds* . . . An alternative system would be for small areas, say a parish, to choose primary electors who would group together in, say, county areas and choose the members¹ . . . No government will be wiser or honest than its electors. There is no perfect solution of the representative system except by an educated electorate. The wiser the voter the less often will he choose a fool or a rogue." (pp. 116-133).¹

The best way to secure the needed "educated electorate" is to 'broadcast' as diligently and constantly as possible the principles (1) of Social Organisation by Functions, Varna-Dharma, (2) of 'Individual Organisation' by Life-Stages, Ashrama-Dharma, and (3) of Selection and Election of those who are really worthy to be elected, Puro-hiṭa-Dharma, by their ethical as well as intellectual qualifications, i.e., instructions as to whom to choose, how to recognise that they are worthy to be chosen.¹

This is the most important part in the political education of public opinion, and comparatively very easy to

¹ See Bhagavan Das, *The Crux in Politics*, or *Who should be Legislators*, and Das, *Outline Scheme of Swaraj*, re functional and other qualifications of the elected, and re indirect election. 'Purohiṭa' means 'he who has been put forward selected, elected' to lead in good, public, pious works.

carry out, if only the Social Structure, the Fundamental Institutions of Society, can be agreed upon generally.

In the seventh and last chapter, Mr. Taylor states "the guildsman's *philosophy of life*". "The chief fault of the learned is that they have no *sense of proportion*, which is a high philosophic quality usually reserved for the simple. Education is too often an overbalancing of *of the values of life* . . . We should get the Social machinery of the Guild State in its proper proportion against the background of life as a whole . . . Until we know *what we want life to be*, we shall never be quite sure whether we ought to have the guilds, or how we would use them when we get them. They are merely a means. Reformers so continuously harp on the *machinery* and forget the *men* for whose use it was made. The machinery is good only if it suits his *ultimate purposes in life*.¹ . . . Without some understanding of *what he finally intends to do*, the guildsman may easily grasp the form of the guilds and find that the spirit has escaped . . . What is the ideal of the Modern Man, of the champions of the Modern State? . . . The main note of modern life is a rushing, roaring tumult of noise and rapid motion. If the Modern Man can have two of anything, he feels himself infinitely better than if he had only one. He is unfortunately limited by one mouth, one stomach, by twenty-four hours in the day, and other ridiculous failings of a Nature that is so carelessly unambitious . . . His is a Philosophy of Multiples . . . His questions can be answered only in terms of quantity, space, velocity . . . Newspaper offices,

¹ See p. 57, *supra*, for the traditional Indian views as to the fundamental and ultimate purposes of life.

government departments, business houses really believe that this monstrosity is the normal man of to-day . . . a heroic creature of energy continually asserting himself . . . always desiring to rule his fellows and interfere with their lives as much as possible . . . That is their conception of the great man. It is an astounding blunder . . . The vast majority of the people of this world have no resemblance to this human motor-bus . . . The normal man is sane, exceedingly stable, more concerned with daily occupations than with rushing along. Normal life is quiet, not tumult . . . We have it continually dinned into our ears that it is the striving, competitive, ambitious, self-assertive and noisy person who has made the 'progress' of the world. But whither is this 'progress' taking us?" There follows a lurid picture of the evil side of modern civilisation. "Are the people of England really so much happier because their fathers had the energy to conquer an empire; or is the whole idea of empire merely a clever trick of the plutocrats and the government officials to get their profits and salaries out of it? . . . Highly centralised and skilled government has turned people into a herd of well-governed sheep and moral degenerates who could assassinate their neighbours and think they were lofty-souled patriots when they drove in their bayonet. . . . Half the defence of the Modern State is insolent bluff . . . We have millionaires instead of the millennium, and factory hands and smoke instead of a peasantry who at least could see the sun¹ . . . The real heart of the Guild-idea is not a mere rearrangement of the social

¹ In India, while factories and smoke are increasing, the peasantry has yet a chance of seeing the sun, but has not enough bread left for its stomach.

machinery but an attempt to express a rearrangement of human ideals. We merely wish to cling to the fundamental facts of human nature." (pp. 133-153.)

The Ancient Indian Scheme of Social Organisation provides room, and just and not more than just opportunities, for all types, the restless and ambitious as well as the quiet and the peaceful, the *ḍaitya* or *asura* as well as the *ḍva*, the *kṣatṛiya* as well as the *brāhmaṇa* and *vaishya* and *shūdra*. 'Human ideals' have all been arranged by it in an orderly and systematic fashion,¹ and when Mr. Taylor says that "sense of proportion is a high philosophic quality usually reserved for the simple," it adds, 'or for those who have completed the cycle of graded philosophies and come full round and become simple a second time, and *on a higher level*, have become as little children again and entered the kingdom of heaven, *i.e.*, of righteousness, even while still on earth.'²

III. Roads to Freedom, by Bertrand Russell

Roads to Freedom outlines and criticises the theories of (1) (State) Socialism, (2) (philosophical) Anarchism, (3) Syndicalism, (4) Guild Socialism. In the Introduction he himself sums up his conclusions thus :

"My own opinion is that pure Anarchism, though it should be the ultimate ideal, to which Society should continually approximate, is for the present impossible and would not survive for more than a year or two

¹ See Bhagavan Das, *The Science of Social Organisation, or the Laws of Manu*, ch. i.

² *Manu*, i, 3 ; vi, 82.

if it were adopted.¹ On the other hand, both Marxian Socialism and Syndicalism, in spite of many drawbacks, seem to me calculated to give rise to a happier and better world than that in which we live. I do *not*, however, regard either of them as the *best* practicable system. Marxian Socialism, I fear, would give *far too much power to the State*, while Syndicalism, which aims at abolishing the State, would, I believe, find itself forced to reconstruct a *central authority* in order to put an end to rivalries of different groups of producers. *The best practicable system*, to my mind, is that of *Guild Socialism*, which concedes what is valid both in the claims of the State Socialist and in the Syndicalist fear of the State, by adopting a system of Federalism among trades for reasons similar to those which are recommending Federalism among nations." (pp. 12-13.)

The Introduction ends with an appeal to opponents to endeavour to *understand* each other.

"Most men have instinctively two entirely different codes of behaviour; one towards those whom they regard as companions or colleagues or friends, . . . the other towards those whom they regard as enemies or outcastes or a danger to Society . . . The class-war, like war between nations, produces two opposing views, each equally true and equally untrue . . . The Socialist is not a cynic, but merely the friend of the wage-earner, maddened by the spectacle of the needless misery which capitalism inflicts upon them . . . Whatever

¹ These views are similar to those of the *Purāṇas*, as regards the ideal conditions of the Satya-yuga Age, past and to return, and of certain vanished republics like those of the Uṭṭara-Kurus; and as regards the horrors of *a-rājakam* (literally, anarchy) in the present condition of mankind; (*Manu*, I, 35; *Mbh.*, Shanti-parva, chs. 55 to 66.)

bitterness and hate may be found in the movements which we are to examine, it is not bitterness or hate, but love, that is their mainspring. It is difficult not to hate those who torture the objects¹ of our love. Though difficult, it is not impossible; but it requires a breadth of outlook and a comprehensiveness of understanding which are not easy to preserve amid a desperate conflict.¹ If ultimate wisdom has not always been preserved by Socialists and Anarchists, they have not differed in this from their opponents; and in the source of their inspiration they have shown themselves superior to *those who acquiesce* ignorantly or *supinely in the injustices and oppressions* by which the existing system is preserved . . . The radical reformers appear inconceivably cynical and misjudging to the capitalist, because the facts upon which their view is based are *facts which he* either does not know or *habitually ignores.*" (pp. 18-19.)

Later on, he says, "It would be wholly unfair to judge Anarchist doctrine or the views of its leading exponents by such phenomena; but it remains a fact that Anarchism attracts to itself much that lies on the borderland of insanity and common crime. This must be remembered in exculpation of the authorities and the thoughtless public, who often confound in a common detestation the parasites of the movement and the truly heroic and high-minded men who have elaborated its theories and sacrificed comfort and success to its

¹ Mahatma Gandhi's gospel of Non-violence and of the need to discard all personal and racial hatred, in the political struggle which entered on a new phase in India, under his leadership, in 1919-20, writes the commentary on these sentences.

propagation . . . The attitude of the better Anarchists is that expressed by L. S. Bevington in the words: 'Of course we know that among those who call themselves Anarchists there are a minority of unbalanced enthusiasts who look upon every illegal and sensational act of violence as a matter for hysterical jubilation. Very useful to the police and the press, unsteady in intellect and of weak moral principle, they have repeatedly shown themselves accessible to venal considerations. They, and their violence, and their professed Anarchism are purchaseable, and in the last resort they are welcome and efficient partisans of the bourgeoisie in its remorseless war against the deliverers of the people.' Her conclusion is a very wise one: 'Let us leave indiscriminate killing and injuring to the Government—to its Statesmen, its Stock-brokers, its Officers, and its Law.' . . ." (pp. 67-68.)

"Guild Socialists aim at autonomy in industry, with consequent *curtailment*, but *not abolition*, of the power of the State. The *system* which they advocate is, I believe, the *best* hitherto proposed, and the one most likely to secure liberty without the constant appeal to violence which are to be feared under a purely Anarchist régime . . . The State would own the means of production as *Trustee* for the community; the Guilds would manage them, also as *trustees* for the community, and would pay to the State a *single tax* or rent . . . A *tribunal equally representing* the whole body of *producers* and the whole body of *consumers* . . . would be the *ultimate sovereign body* . . . Guild Socialism accepts the view that liberty is not to be secured by making the State the employer; the State and the Municipality as employers have turned out not

to differ essentially from the private capitalist." (pp. 92-93.)

"What our modern society needs is *not* a little *tinkering* here and there, not the kind of minor re-adjustments to which the existing holders of power may readily consent, but a *fundamental reconstruction* . . . 'Capitalism has made of work a purely commercial activity, a soulless and a joyless thing. But substitute the national service of the guilds for the profiteering of the few; substitute responsible labor for a saleable commodity; substitute self-government and decentralisation for the bureaucracy and demoralising hugeness of the modern State and the modern joint stock company; and then it may be just, once more, to speak of a *joy in labor*, and once more to hope that men may be proud of quality and not only of quantity in their work' . . ." (pp. 94-95.)

"The desire for a *more just distribution of the world's goods* is the main inspiration of most Socialism and Anarchism . . . There is no reason why work should remain the *dreary drudgery in horrible conditions* that most of it is now . . . Kropatkin has set himself to prove that if production were more scientific and better organised, a comparatively small amount of quite agreeable work would suffice to keep the whole population in comfort. He probably somewhat exaggerates what is possible with our present scientific knowledge; it must nevertheless be conceded that his contentions contain a very large measure of truth . . . He says: '*Overwork is repulsive* to human nature —*not work* . . . If there is still work which is really disagreeable in itself, it is only because our *scientific men have never cared* to consider the means of rendering it less so; they have always known that there were

plenty of starving men who would do it for a few pence a day.' . . . I think it must be conceded that much necessary work must always remain disagreeable or at least partly monotonous, and that *special privileges* will have to be accorded to those who undertake it . . . Much of the work that needs doing could be made agreeable, if thought and care were given to this object. Even now, it is often only *long hours* that make work irksome. If the normal hours of work were reduced to, say, four, as they could be by better organisation and more scientific methods, a very great deal of work which is now felt as a burden would quite cease to be so . . . By economic self-government . . . a very large proportion of the necessary work of the world could ultimately be made sufficiently agreeable to be preferred before idleness even by men whose bare livelihood would be assured whether they worked or not. As to the residue, let us admit that *special rewards*, whether in *goods*, or *honours*, or *privileges*, would have to be given to those who undertake it." (pp. 64, 105-114.)

It is obvious that 'goods,' 'honours,' 'privileges' are only other names for 'wealth,' 'honor,' '(official) power or authority'. Samskr̥t names would respectively be *sammāna*, *īśhīṭā* (or *īśhvarabhāva*, which is the word used in the *Gītā*, or *aishvarya*, or *ājñā-shakti* which is the word used in *shukra-nīti*), *dhana*, and *kṛidā*; in Persian-Arabic, *izzaṭ hukūmat*, *ḍaulat*, *īafrīh* (or *sair-ṭamashā* or *lahw-o-lā'b*).

"The proposal (of the Anarchists) that there should be no obligation to work, and no economic reward for work . . . is very doubtful . . . The Socialist theory is that, in general, work alone gives the right to the enjoyment of the produce of work." (pp. 116-117.)

"Socialists imagine that the Socialist State will be governed by men like those who now advocate it. This is of course *a delusion*. The rulers of the State then will bear as little resemblance to the present Socialists as the dignitaries of the Church after the time of Constantine bore to the Apostles. The men who advocate an unpopular reform are exceptional in disinterestedness and zeal for the public good; but those who hold power after the reform has been carried out, are likely to belong, in the main, to the *ambitious executive type* which has in all ages possessed itself of the government of nations. And this type has *never* shown itself *tolerant of opposition or friendly to freedom*." (p. 118.)

The *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels ends with the resounding words: "Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, unite!" But what will happen after the proletarians have lost their chains and gained the world? Marx does not seem to have spent much thought upon that most important kind of working-man, the peasant, who seems to have been looked upon by him as a sort of savage not worthy of much care or attention. The working man, the proletarian, seems to have meant to him mostly the mill-hand, the machinery-worker. But, assuming that new Russia's practical commentary on Marxian theory will so mechanise and collectivise agriculture as to expand the sense of the word proletarian to include the peasant also, the question remains, Will not these proletarians evolve amidst themselves, unavoidably, a new Ruling Class? Have they not already done so, in new Russia, *viz.*, the Communists? Have not the Communists evolved a

Dictator, the apex of the Ruling Pyramid? Periodic wars between different bodies of men of this 'ambitious executive' (i.e., the perverted *kshatṛiya* or *hākim*) type—is unintelligent Nature's way to keep in order 'the keepers of law and order'. Constant moral and spiritual pressure on the one side by the 'learned' (or *brāhmaṇa* or *ālim*) type, and economic and industrial pressure by the other two types on the other side—is intelligent Nature's way to do it, in a wisely organised society. To the question, '*Quies custodiet custodes?*' 'Who will watch the watchers?' the only answer is, 'The other three Guilds, the Guild of the 'Learned' leading, under the direction of the central Legislature.'

"The plan we are advocating amounts essentially to this, that a certain small income sufficient for necessities, should be secured to all, whether they work or not, and that a larger income—as much larger as might be warranted by the total amount of commodities produced—should be given to those who are willing to engage in some work which the community recognises as useful . . . I do not think it is always necessary to pay more highly work which is more skilled or regarded as socially more useful, since such work is more interesting and more respected than ordinary work, and will therefore often be preferred by those who are able to do it." (pp. 119-120.)

The only change which Indian tradition suggests, in the above, is the replacement of the words "whether they work or not" by the words "who are willing to do suitable work" and the substitution, for "a larger income (in cash), etc.," of "special rewards, of honor, or power, or wealth should be given or allowed to those

¹ *Manu*, ix, 320-322.

men of thought, of action, and of desire, who do special corresponding work". It has to be borne in mind that, with the great difference in the nature of the *inner* culture and outlook upon life of such a co-operative and public-spirited civilisation, *public possessions* would become much richer and more abundantly spread all over the land, *for the use of all*, and the *need and the greed for large private incomes* for the gratification of the taste for luxuries would become *minimised*. This seems to be the case now in the re-planned or newly-planned Russian towns, with their plentiful "Parks of Culture and Rest," and to have been the case in the East, when temples, lamaseries, mosques, mausolea, *dharma-shālās*, *khāneqāhs*, etc., with appropriate appurtenances, were built finely, were maintained properly, and served genuinely, the spiritual as well as cultural, æsthetic, educational, medical and other social and personal needs of the public in many ways, and not the vices and avarices of the priestcrafty keepers. The case of the Medieval Abbeys in Europe was somewhat similar, when they happened, rarely, to have really good men as abbots and subordinates.

"The Guild Socialists, though some regard them as extremists, really represent the English love of *compromise*¹ . . . The views of Marx on the State are not very clear. On the one hand he seems willing, like the modern State Socialists, to allow great power to the State, but on the other hand he suggests that when the

¹ Greater love of just compromise, giving to everyone his due, and not more than due, is not possible than is shown by the Indian Scheme, which expressly includes and provides for all types and all stages of life and evolution, fully recognising, in *theory* and in *practice*, that "it takes all kinds to make a world".

Socialist revolution has been completed, the State as we know it will disappear . . . Guild Socialists are dissatisfied with the old State Socialism, but they are unable to accept the Anarchist view that Society can dispense altogether with a central authority . . . Theft (of various kinds), crimes of violence, of jealousy, rape, cruelty to children, and so forth, are almost certain to occur in any Society to some extent," also attempts by the ambitious "to subvert the Anarchist régime by force," in short, perversions and excesses of the three primal instincts; and "we have every reason to think that the power which the State derives from the criminal law cannot be entirely abolished, though it can be exercised in a wholly different spirit, without vindictiveness and the moral reprobation which now form its essence".¹ (pp. 123-136).

"State Socialists argue as if there would be no danger to liberty in a State not based upon Capitalism. *This is an entire delusion.* Given an official caste, however selected, there are bound to be a set of men whose whole instincts will drive them towards tyranny. Together with the natural love of power, they will have a rooted conviction, visible now in the higher ranks of the Civil Service, that *they alone know enough* to be able to judge what is for the good of the community. Like all men who administer a system, they will come to feel the system itself sacrosanct," for the obvious reason that their pays, powers, privileges, pleasures, are all based on and derived from it, in ever-increasing degree.² "The only changes they will desire will be changes in the

¹ *Manu*, xi, 189, says the same.

² अर्थस्य पुरुषो दासः, नार्थोदासस्तु कस्यचित् । *Mbh.*

direction of *further regulations* as to how the people are to enjoy the good things kindly granted to them by their benevolent despots. Whoever thinks this picture overdrawn must have failed to study the influence and methods of Civil Servants at present. On every matter that arises, they know far more than the general public about all the *definite* facts involved; the one thing they *do not know* is *where the shoe pinches*. But those who know this are probably not skilled in stating their case, not able to say offhand exactly how many shoes are pinching how many feet, or what is the precise remedy required. *The answer prepared for Ministers by the Civil Servants* is accepted by the 'respectable' public as impartial and is regarded as disposing of the case of malcontents . . . That at least is the way in which things are managed in England," (and, of course, far more so in India). "And there is every reason to fear that under Socialism the *power of officials* would be *vastly greater* than at present" (pp. 136-137), for the obvious reason that all the Four Functions and the Four Powers, all the educational institutions and the press, all the guns and the bombs, all the money-bags, and all the horny hands, would be under their thumbs and their heels, to use and abuse and misuse at will. What Bertrand Russell only feared when he wrote in 1918, has been turned into fact by the new Russia with its omnipotent Dictatorship, and has been openly copied by Italy and is being surreptitiously copied by all Capitalist States, under other names, and minus the relieving features of Bolshevism.

"It is undeniable that to all who care for progress, actual experience of democratic representative government is very disillusioning. Admitting, as I think we

must, that it is preferable to any *previous* form of Government, we must yet acknowledge that much of the criticism directed against it by Anarchists and Syndicalists is thoroughly justified . . . But it must be confessed that the Syndicalists' . . . doctrine (as to method) is an appeal to force, and is naturally met by an appeal to force on the other side . . . Persuasion is a slow process . . . but the ultimate goal of any reformer who aims at liberty can only be reached through persuasion," and "appeal to the effective will of the community". (pp. 138-139.)

"Certain *defects* seem *inherent* in the very nature of *representative institutions*. There is a sense of self-importance, inseparable from success in a contest for popular favor. There is an all but unavoidable habit of hypocrisy, . . . cynicism, . . . flattery . . . This is as much the fault of democracy as of the representatives . . . However the blame may be apportioned, *the evil . . . is bound to occur in the existing forms of democracy*. Another evil, especially noticeable in large States, is the *remoteness* of the seat of government from many of the constituencies—a remoteness which is *psychological* even more than geographical . . . All these causes lead *Parliaments* to *betray* the people, consciously or unconsciously." (pp. 139-140.)

"The *government of a group, chosen by the group*, will be far more in touch with its constituents, far more conscious of their interests, than a remote Parliament nominally representing the whole country." But the growth of the spirit of bureaucracy must be guarded against. "Trade Union officials as soon as they become part of the governing forces in the country, tend to become autocratic and conservative; they lose touch

with their constituents and gravitate, by a *psychological sympathy*, into co-operation with the powers that be . . . *The only way of preserving sufficient liberty . . . is the organisation of citizens with special interests into groups*, determined to preserve autonomy as regards their internal affairs . . . Granting that the State in some form must continue, we must also grant that its powers ought to be very strictly limited to what is absolutely necessary. There is no way of limiting its powers except by means of *groups* which are *jealous* of their privileges and *determined* to preserve their autonomy."

If only Society were properly organised into the Four Great Guilds with their sub-guilds, thus jealously watchful of their own and one another's *rights-and-duties*, and determined to maintain them; if the rationale of such organisation, such Varna-Dharma, Nazm-ul-Jamā'a't, pervaded the mental and moral atmosphere of the country like the health-giving fragrance of medicinal incense; if the meaning of Self-government were universally recognised as legislation by persons embodying the *higher* Self, the *better* side of human nature, intellectual and moral, and not the worse; if the Āshrama-Dharma, the Nazm-i-Shakhsiya^t, the planning of the Individual life into Four Stages, were duly observed, and persons regularly retired after the second stage, of 'competitive private household life,' into third stage, of 'unremunerated public service,' *yajña*, *tyāga*, *isār*, *qurbānī*; these persons worthy to make laws promotive of the general welfare and preventive of ills, would be available in sufficiency; and then the election of 'representatives' by the 'democracy' would become a solemn yet also joyous 'ceremonial,' for the

unanimous public recognition and honoring of the people's loved and trusted, and their installation in the seat of the law-giver, the Dharma-nyavasthāpaka, Vidhātā, Purohita, the Mujtahid, Mufī, Muhaqqiq, Muqannin; it would become a 'religious fair,' an occasion of public rejoicing, a glad festival, of bathing in refined and refining emotions as at a Kumbha-snāna in the pure and purifying waters of the Gangā, or of a great reunion of kinsmen and friends as at an Īd-ul-fitr assemblage in the House of God, or as on a Dīpāvalī night of illumination in the streets of a happy, prosperous, populous town; instead of being, as at present, a letting loose of torrents of false propaganda and malicious decrīal and abuse of one another, a riot and welter of the worst forms of the well-known 'diplomacies' of *sāma*, *ḍāna*, *bhēḍa*, *ḍanda*, i.e., cajolery, bribery, back-biting, intimidation, a plunging of the whole population into the cesspools and the marshes of the most sordid, evil, coarsening, toxic emotions, with lasting and most mischievous effects in jealousy, hate, bitterness, demoralisation and spiritual degradation.

In chap. vi, Bertrand Russell discusses "International Relations" in the light of the principles of Guild Socialism.

"The main objects are . . . (1) the avoidance of wars, (2) the prevention of the oppression of the weaker nations by strong ones." He shows that it is only *half the truth* that "all modern wars are due to Capitalism". He fully recognises its subornation and prostitution of the Press, its promotion of "the pugnacity which tends to be developed in men who have the habit of command," which makes a person "become autocratic, . . . indignant when he finds opposition, convinced

that opposition is wicked and must be crushed, . . . much more willing than the average citizen to resort to war against his rivals". "Accordingly we find . . . that in the main those who have most power are most warlike" and this evil "will only be cured by the abolition of Capitalism *if* the new system is one which allows *very much less power to single individuals*. It will not be cured by a system which substitutes the powers of Ministers or Officials for the power of the Capitalists".

Then he discusses the *remaining half of the truth*. "There were wars before there was Capitalism . . . The existing evils in international relations"—and we may well add in all human relations—"spring, at bottom, from *psychological causes*, from motives forming part of *human nature* as it is at present, chiefly competitiveness, love of power, and envy". We may note that all these are aspects of Greed, Pride, and Egotism (*i.e.*, Conceit or Vanity plus Egoism or Selfishness), which, in turn, are aberrations and excesses of the three primary Instincts of Property, of Sex and Family, and of the Will-to-be (the Will-to-live, the Will-to-be-prominent). Capitalism itself is the product of Greed; Militarist Imperialism of Pride; Kultur-Missionarism, 'White-Man's-Burden'-ism, of Egotism.

"If an economic re-organisation . . . can so change education and environment as to enormously diminish the strength of the competitive instinct" as well as the other instincts, "it may provide a real safeguard against war, but if not, the hopes of universal peace will prove delusive . . . The *psychology of the working man* in any of the Western democracies is *totally unlike* that which is assumed in the *Communist Manifesto*. He does not by any means feel that he has nothing to lose

but his chains; nor, indeed, is this true. The chains which bind Asia and Africa in subjection to Europe are partly riveted by him. He is himself part of a great system of tyranny and exploitation. Not only do the working men of a country like England have a share in the benefit accruing from the exploitation of inferior races, but many among them also have their part in the capitalist system". There is also the fact of "instinctive race-hatred" further embittered by fear of the "labor-competitions" of the 'colored races'. "Ants are as completely socialistic as any community can possibly be, yet they put to death any ant which strays among them by mistake from a neighbouring ant-heap."

The phenomena of Fascism in Italy, which seems to have as its great supporters and instruments, for the holding down of the poorest sections of workmen, the 'lower middle class' and the 'capitalist-proletarians' mentioned by Mr. Russell, and of Nationalist Socialism or Nazism in Germany and other countries, which have arisen after Mr. B. Russell wrote, support his views. There is also the fact that, in Russia, the chains which have been lost by the "proletarians" seem to have been gained by the *muzhiks*, at least for the time that it may take for their cultivation to become collectivised and mechanised, their villages urbanised, and themselves converted into and raised to the status of machine-working "proletarians," a consummation which may well be wished for, with due reservations, by all well-wishers of humanity.¹

¹ Prof. Edward Conze, writing in the *Manchester Guardian* (reprinted in the *Allahabad Leader* dated 24-8-1934) says:

"The first condition for Fascist success is that the economic system of the country is on the edge of breakdown, as it was

Referring to the League of Nations (then in project), he says, "A *different mental and moral atmosphere* from in Italy in 1921, and has been in Germany since 1931, and as Sir Oswald Mosley expects it to be in England. Then the conflict of interests is driven to such a point of tension that it can be solved only by a disruption or by an *expansion of the existing system*. Disruption means civil war. The purpose of *Fascism* is to solve serious economic difficulties, which are bound to lead to civil war, through *imperialist expansion* and ultimately through imperialistic war. The entire policy of Fascism amounts to creating the conditions for a successful imperialist policy. Terror, propaganda, *inexpensive* but impressive *concessions to the workers*, measures leading to *State Capitalism*, establish *internal unity*, the *pre-requisite of modern war*. Technically, war is prepared by re-armament, the policy of economic self-sufficiency, and a high birth-rate. Education and *propaganda* train the minds of the people to expect and even to desire war and to develop an 'heroic' attitude to life . . . The average peace-loving citizen will back that party which seems able to avoid the civil war, even at the expense of an external war later on. There always remains the hope that the external war can somehow be avoided . . . *Imperialism* extends the inner market by creating a demand for *war goods*, and it widens the external market by subsidies and by extending *political influence* into foreign countries, or, as in the case of Mosley's defensive imperialism, by *tightening the grip over the existing empire*. The situation which creates the case for Fascism mobilises also its troops. A serious *economic decline* affects not so much the organised employers and the organised factory workers as the unorganised masses of the *middle classes* and the *unemployed*. They become the *recruiting ground* of Fascism." In Germany, "the *unemployed*, especially the young, were largely attracted by Hitler . . . They were driven to such a state of *despair* that even war preparations came as a relief . . . 'Better an end with terror than a terror without end.' . . . The Communists always treated the '*petty bourgeois*' as inferior beings anyway. The ruined and excited *middle classes* had to find a new party. They took their revenge by rallying round Hitler." Briefly, Fascism is Capitalist-Imperialism disguised in rhetoric.

Mr. H. N. Brailsford writes (quoted in *The Modern Review* for October, 1934): Fascism is growing in England; it has attained prominence in the news, . . . has seventeen thousand active, paying members, (mostly) young men, chiefly of the *middle class*, who perform quasi-military exercises and drill. They have some armoured cars, and with five or six aeroplanes

that to which we are accustomed in international affairs will be necessary if agreements between nations are to as a nucleus are forming an air force. They are exceedingly active in conducting an incessant campaign of public meetings all over the country . . . They seem to command an unlimited supply of money."

The Moscow correspondent of the *Observer* (reprinted in the *Leader* dated 31-8-1934) writes: "There are several marked new trends in Soviet life . . . Three of these are, greater *stabilisation*, growing *nationalism*, increasing *material inequality* . . . The *peasants* have reluctantly resigned themselves to the system of collective farming which was forced on them ruthlessly. The Soviet Government, on its side, seems to have given up the idea of pushing the peasants into full-blooded communes, and is lavish with promises of more manufactured goods. The *struggle between the Government and the peasantry* reached its most ferocious form in the great famine of 1932-33 . . . when no foreign journalist was permitted to visit the stricken areas . . . The Government *exacted its full pound of flesh from the peasants*, and left them to take the consequences of their 'sabotage' which amounted to *mass starvation* . . . The *struggle is not over (yet and will) never be until the peasant*, within or without the framework of the collective farm system, obtains *more freedom* in determining the conditions of labor, *more voice* in disposing of his products, a *fairer share* of the national income . . . some *relaxation* of the more extreme rigours of recent years points to a period of *greater stability* and less violent change . . . The pronounced new *Nationalism* of the Soviet Union finds its clearest reflection in the much more active *foreign policy* which the Soviet Government is now pursuing . . . which is almost certain to handicap further, if not to paralyse completely, the activity of the Communist International . . . Now Soviet patriotism is trumpeted in all the Russian newspapers, and such phrases as 'our beloved Socialist fatherland' and 'our great country' are becoming very familiar . . . A permanent growth of material inequality would seem to be the inevitable result of the strident present-day insistence on *unequal wages and salaries*, on markedly *high compensation* for persons in *more responsible posts* . . . Stalin (contrary to Lenin) is eloquent in extolling the merits of superior rewards for industry and capability . . . When classes are officially abolished—this is supposed to occur in 1937, when the second Five-Year Plan comes to an end—*new classes*, based, not on inherited wealth or birth, but on *power*, on *status* in the *huge hierarchy of state officialdom*, and distinguished by *very different standards of living*, will become much more visible. . . . If

succeed in averting catastrophes . . . *No idea is so practical as the idea of the Brotherhood of Man*, if only people can be startled into believing in it."

The Theosophical Society started to practicalise this idea, so long as sixty years ago, but has not done all it might have done, and human nature has been too impervious to the idea so far. The World-War almost succeeded in 'startling' the nations into believing in it, but the forces of Darkness and Diplomacy drove it away again. The World-Bankruptcy is again pressing it on the attention of the world, and Capitalist Financial juggling is again trying to thrust it away.

Mr. Russell refers to the problems of Africa and Asia, and "more particularly India and Persia". "What stands in the way of the freedom of Asiatic populations is not their lack of intelligence, but only their lack of military prowess, which make them an easy prey to our lust for dominion." But Indians may well say that their

these trends continue, the line of distinction between the Soviet Union and the various Fascist States will become dimmer. There is already substantial *common ground between Bolshevism and Fascism* in their common love of militant phrases, contempt for liberalism and democracy, and technique of government through a combination of intensive propaganda and mass organisation combined with ruthless repression". The writer casually refers to "the new industrial construction in the Soviet Union," "the draining of the Italian Marshes by Mussolini," "the laying down of automobile roads by Hitler," to find employment for the unemployed.

At a meeting to elect delegates for the International Congress against War and Fascism, Mrs. Mellwrick is reported to have said, in Manchester, in August, 1934, that Fascism in Italy had deprived the industrial worker of his freedom, and that Nazism in Germany was victimising Communists and Jews and women.

The above notes bring up to-date, information regarding Bolshevism and Fascism—Nazism, and help to confirm the conclusions and suggestions *ré* Guild-Socialism made in the text, as to its power of reconciling all classes and interests.

'military prowess' has been sufficiently proved so recently as in the World-War; that the real cause of their subjection is internal dissensions pertaining to class, caste, creed, color, race, and sex, which have poisoned the moral blood of the people and are appearing in festering sores all over the body politic; and that this may well be regarded as due to 'lack of intelligence' amounting to *insanity* on the part of the vast bulk of the population, and to 'excess of intelligence' on the part of the cunning political and religious schemers who, for their own purposes are perpetually injecting more and more of that poison into the diseased body. It is noteworthy that the Theosophical Society started the idea of Brotherhood "without distinction of race, creed, caste, colour, or sex," sixty years ago, as said above. The diligent pursuit of its Second Object is the best way to abate the creedal and communal dissensions, which are the worst and the most ruinous. The pursuit of the Third Object must always, in the nature of things, be confined to a very few; but these, if they pursued it with any degree of success, would be able immensely to enlighten, facilitate, and stimulate the studies of the much larger members who could well and successfully pursue the Second.

Mr. Russell rightly says, "We should leave India to choose *its own form of Government, its own manner of education, and its own type of civilisation*. India has an ancient tradition, very different from that of western Europe, a tradition highly valued by educated Hindus, but not loved by our Schools and Colleges." The present little book is a humble and very feeble endeavour (1) to present the essence of just this tradition in the new terms of economics, politics, sociology, psychology, etc.,

which may appeal not only to Hindus but also to the Muslims, Christians and all other religious communities inhabiting India, and especially to the modern-minded and western-educated among these; and (2) also, incidentally, to show that though, no doubt, there are differences of tradition between India and Europe, yet human nature, fundamental instincts, requirements, ills, and the cures therefor, are much the same in essence in both, and the difference is only in the outer forms.

In ch. vii (pp. 168-186) he discusses "whether Socialism would be hostile to Art and Science . . . and would produce a stereotyped Society in which *progress* would become difficult and slow," if not impossible, as in that of the social insects, though some people think, like Mr. G. R. S. Taylor, that 'progress' has come to mean only restless rushing about. "Will the life of the Mind . . . be helped or hindered by Socialism? Will then still be a sufficient *spur to progress* to prevent a condition of Byzantine immobility? . . . The first thing to realise—though it is difficult in a commercial age—is that what is *best in creative mental activity cannot be produced by any system of monetary rewards* . . . Three things are helpful to mental creation: (1) Technical training, (2) liberty to follow the creative impulse, (3) at least the possibility of ultimate *appreciation* by some public, whether large or small". He concludes that "from the point of view of all three requisites, State Socialism would largely fail to remove existing evils and would introduce new evils of its own, but Guild Socialism might be immensely preferable to anything that is possible under the rule of Capitalism".

In ch. viii, the last, (pp. 187-210) he outlines "The World as it could be made." The evils in human life "may be roughly divided into three classes . . . (1) physical evils, among which are death, pain, and the difficulty of making the soil yield a subsistence, (2) evils of character, such as ignorance, lack of will, and violent passions, (3) evils of power, tyranny, interference with free development by force or excessive mental influence . . . The main methods of combating these are, for the first, (the application of) Science; the second, Education in the widest sense and a free outlet for all impulses that do not involve domination; the third, the reform of the political and economic Organisation of Society".

These ideas are a very interesting if incomplete and partial commentary on some aspects of the views of the Sāṅkhya philosophy regarding *duḥkha-traya*, 'the three pains, miseries, evils' that afflict mankind, and the cures therefor. The evils are, (1) *āḍhi-bhauṭika*, material, physical, external, objective, pertaining to the body, (2) *ādhy-ātmika*, mental and moral intellectual and emotional, internal, subjective, pertaining to the mind and soul, (3) *ādhi-daivika*, intermediary, due to the activities of the *powers, forces*, of nature, or of other living beings, superphysical or physical; the cures for the first and the third are applications of physical, superphysical, and sociological (dharma-) sciences; the final cure for the second is education in the deepest and highest sense, philosophy, the understanding of the nature of Spirit and of Matter and of the relation between the two, Self-realisation, which is also the teaching of Vedānta, of Buddhism, Jainism, Sūfism, and Gnosticism.

Mr. Russell then discusses how difficulties could be avoided and various ideals achieved by a system of Guild Socialism—removal of spiritual degradation and freedom from enslavement of the masses, abolition of poverty which is more the effect than the cause of that degradation and serfdom, universal appropriate education of all the educable, self-governing industries, adjustment of rewards and remunerations, improvement of marital relations and domestic conditions, care of the young and avoidance of forcing them “to use their brains to an unnatural degree with consequent listlessness and lack of health in later life,”¹ reduction of government and law to a minimum, healthy international relations, avoidance of “unproductive labour on armaments, national defence, advertisements, costly luxuries for the very rich, or any of the other futilities incidental to our competitive system” and “more joy of life (generally) than we see in the drab tragedy of modern everyday existence”.

Before closing, a few sentences may be quoted which support the view that the men of knowledge, science, art, should be rewarded with *honor* rather than with *money*.

Under Guild Socialism, “Science, labor-saving inventions, technical progress of all kinds,” also Art of

¹ A report very recently published in a British paper, describes the permanently disastrous effects upon the health of man and even more female students who, to cope with the excessive strain of preparation for increasingly difficult examinations, have recourse to stimulating drugs, to keep awake in the nights for continuous study. Conditions are almost worse in India. The present writer, as chairman of the Benares Municipality, 1923-'25 came to know, and took steps to stop, the habit of school-masters to force small boys to keep awake and cram for the annual examinations, by tying them to pillars and posts, to secure more passes.

all kinds, "may be confidently expected to flourish far more than at present, since they will be the road to *honor*, and *honor will have to replace money* among those of the young who desire to achieve success," and we may well add 'also those of the old who have achieved success'. "The life of a discoverer or inventor" or artist "is in itself agreeable"; those who adopt it, as things are now, are *seldom actuated by economic motives*, but rather by the *interest* of the work together with the hope of *honor* . . . There is often in *men of science*, even when they are quite old, something of the *simplicity of a child*; their absorption in abstract thought has held them aloof from the world, and *respect for their work* has led the world to keep them alive in spite of their innocence.¹

To-day, as said before, in the text, the bureaucrat tends to seize for himself all the power of course, and also all the honor, all the money, and all the play and amusement that may be available.

For many reasons should the genuine 'man of God and God's Nature and of Godly and Natural Science and Art' be rewarded with honor rather than with money. He to whom the money-motive appeals is *not* by nature of this type; if the money-motive were artificially implanted and fostered in the mind of any one of this natural congenital quality, then he would degenerate and coarsen and lose his special typical

¹ This is a very good description in brief of the temperament and simple ways of life of the genuine Brāhmaṇa. His simple life, his immersion in clean pure thought, his avoidance of the wear and tear of ambitious struggles and their inseparable loves and hates, alliances and hostilities, his general benevolence—all these of themselves win him reverence from the public and prolong his life. Manu says as much: iv, 2, 94, 148, 149, and ii, 162, 163.

characteristic bye and bye; the finest and noblest work in Science and in Art has *not* been done for love of money in any time and any clime, but has often been done in even extreme and hampering poverty; educators of high quality are wanted in large numbers in order to bring suitable cultural and vocational education within the reach of all the educable members of the younger generation and bring up that generation properly, and there can *never* be money enough available to pay them all richly, consistently with the principle of *equitability* in the distribution of the available world's goods, of the world's annual output of usable necessities, comforts, luxuries; a high-paid, high-living, or miserly and money-hoarding *educator* sets a very bad example to his students, making the well-to-do ones spend-thrifts or misers and the poor ones morally sick with envy, anger, bitterness, and perpetual humiliation; as "tyranny degrades both those who exercise it and those who suffer it" (p. 189), as "mercy blesses both those who give and those who receive it," so honor, reverence, refines and ennobles the minds and hearts of both those who give it discerningly to the worthy and those who receive it being worthy. The honor-motive, if recognised and appreciated properly throughout a land, keeps the eyes and the hearts of the whole people of that land fixed upon high ideals of public usefulness, philanthropy, beneficent living, the very spirit of the best and truest Socialism, and acts as a constant pull upwards to elevate that people physically, mentally, morally, spiritually. Honor is the best and most nutritive sustenance for the heart, and the strongest incentive of the philanthropic man of wisdom. Also, 'plain living' is the natural setting,

and indeed condition, for real 'high thinking'; otherwise, brain-fag, dyspepsia, neurasthenia, phthisis, and other ills instead of helpful scientific and artistic work. The genuine lover of wisdom has indeed no use, no taste, no inclination, no leisure, no energy to spare, for money-making and high living. Necessaries, clean surroundings, very moderate comforts are all that he requires and has use for. Even the multi-millionaires, the huge money-grabbers, after a certain limit, when they have satiated and surfeited their egoism, their *aham-tā* and *mama-tā*, their *khudī* and *hirs*, of "ships in thousands lie below, and men in nations, all are mine," suffer reaction and can do nothing else with their superfluities than to found Universities, Colleges, Hospitals, Research Institutes, build Libraries, Museums, Parks, Peace Palaces, and support Charities and Missions of various sorts, all for 'socialist' service of the public.

Such beneficent use of Wealth, side by side with a just satisfaction of the instinct of *aham-tā* and *mama-tā*, would be immensely stimulated, and also regularised and systematised instead of being left to individual discretion or caprice, by the kind of Guild-Socialism advocated in the text. Instead of being treated as a prostitute, as she is to-day under the Capitalist régime, Wealth would then be worshipped as Lakshmī, the Goddess of all Prosperity, Loka-mātā, the Benign Mother who nourishes *all* the people of the whole world, the Glory of Al-Mālik and Ar-Razzāq, the tender-hearted Provider of Nourishment to all Humanity.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

- The Essential Unity of All Religions.** Indian Edition Rs. 3. Cloth Rs. 4.
- Krishna.** Indian Edition Rs. 2-8. Cloth Rs. 3.
- Laws of Manu in the Light of Atma-Vidya (Theosophy).** Vol. I. Indian Edition Rs. 4. Cloth Rs. 5.
- The Science of the Emotions.** Indian Edition Rs. 4-8. Cloth Rs. 5-8.
- The Science of Peace.** Indian Edition Rs. 4. Cloth Rs. 5.
- The Pranava-vada of Gargyayana** (The Science of the Sacred Word). In 3 Vols. Indian Edition Rs. 4 each. Cloth Rs. 5 each. The 3 Vols., Indian Edition Rs. 10. Cloth Rs. 12.

PAMPHLETS

- The Religion of Theosophy.** As. 2.
- The Fundamental Idea of Theosophy.** As. 2.
- The Superphysics of the Great War.** As. 2.
- The Psychology of Conversion.** As. 2.
- The Metaphysic and Psychology of Theosophy.** Parts I and II. As. 4.
- Indian Ideals of Women's Education.** As. 4.
- Eugenics, Ethics and Metaphysics.** As. 2.
- The Dawn of Another Renaissance.** As. 4.
- The Ethico-Psychological Crux in Political Science and Art.** As. 4.
- Ancient Solutions of Modern Problems.** As. 8.
- Annie Besant and the Changing World.** As. 8.

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE
ADYAR, MADRAS, INDIA

